

# Christian Education

Vol. XIII

MARCH, 1930

No. 6

## THE THIRTEENTH ANNUAL REPORT OF THE EXECUTIVE SECRETARY OF THE COUNCIL OF CHURCH BOARDS OF EDUCATION FOR 1929-1930

ROBERT L. KELLY

The activities of the Council have been concentrated largely this year upon a rather extensive summoning of witnesses to testify on the present status of Christian education in our institutions and agencies. Hundreds of witnesses have responded to our subpoenas. Their testimony is expert testimony. It is impossible in this short report even to submit digests of this data. Those who read and study them will find them of great value. To members of the Council upon request detailed facts will be furnished in addition to the published testimony, which as a rule does not bring out individual or denominational peculiarities. The types of testimony are listed here under thirteen heads.

### EVIDENCE FOR THE DEFENDANT

1. *The testimony of college faculties* In the October issue of CHRISTIAN EDUCATION the testimony of the faculties of four unnamed colleges was offered as to their attitude individually and collectively toward religion as a factor in the college program. There has been an unusual demand for the offprints of this testimony, coming from college presidents, and board and association secretaries. As illustrating this type of testimony and the method of securing it, the record of a conference recently held with the entire faculty of Alfred University is published in the January, 1930, issue of CHRISTIAN EDUCATION. The very illuminating fact was disclosed in this conference that every member of the faculty of the College of Liberal Arts of Alfred University and also of the State School of Ceramics is in thorough

sympathy with the Christian interpretation of life, and the President of the University testified that in the employment of each member this fact had been one of the qualifications determining the appointment. Dr. Oscar Voorhees, Secretary of the United Chapters of Phi Beta Kappa, who was a visitor at the University at the time of the conference, and by invitation sat with the faculty during the conference, remarked that he considered this faculty meeting one of the most unique experiences of his life.

2. *The testimony of 172 college executives.* These college executives are affiliated with the Boards of this Council and a summary of their testimony appears in the January, 1930, CHRISTIAN EDUCATION. This testimony, while disclosing many elements of strength also uncovers considerable weakness, if not neglect. It is found, for instance, that in the faculties under consideration approximately 90 per cent of the members are church members, but that in only 31 per cent of them are "all" or "practically all" of the faculty members considered as actively interested in the religious nurture of students. It is found that in 50 per cent of the colleges chapel services are held five or more times per week, most of these being held on what is known as a compulsory basis, although this does not actually imply much compulsion, and that in the estimate of most of the executives their chapel occasions are distinct contributions to the life of the institutions. Strangely enough it is found that only 15 per cent of the colleges maintain chaplains or pastors; in other words, that the colleges themselves, in general, do not assume much responsibility for the pastoral care of their students. However, the presidents with very few exceptions testify to their earnest purpose to present the entire curriculum on the basis of a Christian philosophy of life.

3. *The testimony of our missionary leaders.* The general secretaries of eight home and thirteen foreign missionary boards in most striking manner testified to the sources of the missionary workers in the field at home and abroad. This evidence is found also in the January issue of CHRISTIAN EDUCATION. It is most valuable and heartening. A quotation from Dr. Robert E. Speer, while not intended as such, really sums up the situation

in general in a few words—"We have no doubt whatever in our own mind as to the absolute necessity of maintaining and strengthening our distinctly Christian institutions."

4. *The testimony of the general secretaries of the boards.* The inquiry which elicited this testimony was confined to the extent to which the acknowledged leaders of the churches were educated in the institutions and agencies of the churches. The testimony has not as yet been completely tabulated and digested.

5. *The testimony of college presidents, chaplains and pastors.* This has had to do with the growing interest in the chapel as an effective instrument of Christian education. Some forty odd colleges have submitted photographs of their chapels, new and old, and these appear in the February issue of CHRISTIAN EDUCATION. This exhibit will constitute a most interesting lesson in visual education. Accompanying the illustrations are descriptions both of the architectural effects and of the programs of Christian education carried on in the chapels and radiating from them. It must be said that in some instances it was found that our collaborators were much more ready to give a description of the architectural construction of their buildings than of the methods by which they were attempting to utilize these buildings in the promotion of the Christian life.

Later it is the purpose to supplement this partial view of the chapel as an agency of Christian education by a more extensive report of testimony from a much larger number of colleges. Before this final report is made it is hoped many chapels may be visited and first hand impressions recorded. Some work of this kind has been done already. In this the Board secretaries can help very much.

6. *The testimony of the theological seminaries.* The hearing of this testimony has not been concluded. The response to date has been from less than half of the seminaries. A large majority of the seminaries which have reported express the belief that both the intellectual and spiritual quality of their students is as high or higher than it was a student generation or two ago. The data from fifty-one seminaries indicate that 65 per cent of their students have college degrees. Of sixty-one seminaries thus far reporting only thirty-five give the actual facts as to the names of

the colleges and universities represented in their entering classes for the past three years. In the undenominational seminaries which have thus far testified, approximately 54 per cent of their students are from denominational colleges.

7. *The testimony of the directors of student and young people's conferences.* A brief report of this testimony will be given at this meeting. A large amount of evidence has been secured. Data are on hand concerning 551 conferences largely of students and young people in general and held under the jurisdiction of thirteen different denominations, the Young Men's Christian Association and the Young Women's Christian Association. Of the 551 conferences, thirty were held under the auspices of the Christian Associations. The facts are very challenging.

8. *The testimony of university workers.* Visits have been made by Mr. Leach to the University of Pennsylvania, Michigan State College, the University of Chicago, the State University of Iowa, the University of Illinois, and Iowa State Teachers College, and hearings have been held on the ground. The results secured in these typical institutions are unusually comprehensive. The final disposition of this material has not yet been determined. Other such visits will follow.

9. *The testimony of teachers of the Bible and religious education.* This is a project for the future. It has not yet been entered upon. What are the objectives for college work in Biblical Literature and Religious Education? Knowledge, the development of character, the commitment to the religious life, or what? And by what methods are these objective sought?

10. *The testimony of writers and authors.* Lists, first of all, are being prepared of the makers of our present literature on Christian education with the titles of their works. Through reviews and abridgements, this literature will be capitalized. Perhaps the Council should delegate someone to undertake a summary of their conclusions and recommendations.

11. *The testimony of the publicity experts.* There is brought together at this meeting a display of college publicity and publicity in Christian education. This may be the nucleus of a co-operative campaign of publicity.

12. *The testimony of special students of Christian education.*



Reference should be made to Professor Raymond B. Stevens' paper on "The Social and Religious Influences of the Small Denominational College" in our December, 1929, *Bulletin*, President William A. Harper's analysis of "The Christian Quality of a College—How Shall We Determine It?" in the January, 1930, CHRISTIAN EDUCATION; to Dr. W. D. Brown's able analysis of "How the Church Colleges Look to the Boards of Education" in the December, 1929, CHRISTIAN EDUCATION, as well as to the proposed new apologetic for Christian education of Dr. H. O. Pritchard to be presented at this session, and indeed to the hundreds of pages of the thirteenth volume of CHRISTIAN EDUCATION.

13. *The testimony of the deans of the graduate schools.* While this testimony was given to the Association of American Colleges, and pertains not directly to Christian education but to the possible revision of methods of educating college teachers, it is of profound significance to the cause which the Council represents. It indicates a remarkable trend in the direction of humanizing and vitalizing the work required by our graduate universities for the Master's and Doctor's degrees.

#### EVIDENCE FOR THE PLAINTIFF

Now, in spite of the generally favorable testimony thus far gathered by the Council-Association office, the friends of Christian education should be solemnly warned against over-complacency. There are in the background no doubt plenty of witnesses for the prosecution and much damaging evidence might be uncovered. An unnamed witness, who has great academic prestige and who has visited some of our agencies during the year, makes a severe arraignment of much of the work carried on in them. A brief summary of his strictures may be given here. Of course, not all of these strictures apply to any one institution. The Bible teaching does not have the respect of university faculties; the number of students taking these courses is surprisingly small; the teaching function has led to discord in the churches; the multiplication of agencies brings about duplication and waste; the indoctrination of members and adherents of various churches is not an enterprise appropriate to be recognized by university credit; spirited religious work and teaching

without university credit is capable of being more effective than teaching with university credit; in a university a school of religion should concern itself with the study of religion and leave evangelism and the practical application of Christian ethics to the churches and allied interests; the purpose of the work observed is to *teach* religion, not to *study* religion and religious phenomena; to evangelize, not to weigh and consider and learn to judge with an open mind; to incorporate the current practices of religion into the universities. A school of religion should not become identified with the student social and religious activities. *In fine*, the teaching is necessarily partisan, evangelical and opposed to open-minded judgment by the students; if the university engages directly or indirectly in partisan, dogmatic teaching and in evangelistic efforts in behalf of any or all of the churches, the essential character of the university is abandoned. It is the business of the men and women who compose this Council, carefully to weigh all such evidence, both for the defendant and the plaintiff. It is all stimulating and enlightening.

Among the important actions of the Executive Committee during the year have been the election of Raymond H. Leach, Dean of Men at the University of Nevada, as Associate Secretary; the appointment of President D. J. Cowling as chairman of the joint committee of the Association of American Colleges and the Council of Church Boards of Education on a uniform blank for college statistics; the approval of another issue of the *Handbook of Christian Education* in January, 1931; the appointment of Dr. A. E. Kirk as official representative of the Council on the Illinois-Wisconsin Religious Education Survey Committee; the election of Dr. Milton C. Towner, President of the Triennial Conference of Church Workers in Universities, as an *ex-officio* member of the University Committee; the request that the constituent Boards of Education in publishing the names of affiliated institutions indicate definitely the basis and character of the affiliation.

In accordance with the custom of our colleges, Mr. Leach was given a tentative appointment for one year and began his duties on October 1, 1929.

The work of Dr. Cowling's committee has been held up temporarily by the delay of the United States Bureau of Education in appointing a representative on the Committee.

Dr. Kirk will make a report of progress at this meeting.

Dr. Towner is meeting with us this year.

The plan proposed last year for a conference with officials of normal schools did not develop. It seems evident that, in this field as in all others, the established policy of the Council should prevail, of responding to individual institutions and groups of institutions which feel the need of our services and extend invitations for visits.

The plan to dramatize Christian education in cooperation with the Commission on Financial and Fiduciary Matters is still in the making.

For the first time in the Council's history the Treasurer's report shows a sizable balance this year. This is due to a variety of causes, among which may be mentioned with gratitude increased appropriations by the Congregational and Methodist Episcopal Boards and by the Association of American Colleges, the assumption of Dr. Mather's expenses to the Chattanooga meeting a year ago by the Baptist Board, and the prepayment of the appropriation of this year by the Board of the Reformed Church in the U. S. The chief cause for the larger balance must be attributed to the fact that the budget was adopted with provision for an entire year's service by an Associate Secretary and his stenographer. Since Mr. Leach did not begin his work until

#### *Council Budget—1930\**

<i>Estimated Receipts</i>	<i>1930</i>	
Constituent Boards of Education.....	\$18,160.00	
CHRISTIAN EDUCATION Subscriptions and Sales.....	2,500.00	
Special Donations .....	350.00	
Miscellaneous (including interest on bank balance).....	100.00	
	<hr/>	
	\$21,110.00	
Balance in Bank, Office Petty Cash, and Travel Revolving Funds, January 1.....	7,255.84	
<b>TOTAL .....</b>	<hr/>	<b>\$28,365.84</b>

\* The budget as printed was approved by the Executive Committee, February 8, 1930. See Minutes of the Annual Meeting, p. 386.

<i>Total Receipts for'd</i> .....		\$28,365.84
<i>Estimated Disbursements*</i>		
Salaries .....	\$15,923.32	
Rent ( $\frac{1}{2}$ ) .....	1,250.00	
Office Expenses ( $\frac{1}{2}$ ) .....	1,250.00	
Office Equipment (new room) ( $\frac{1}{2}$ ) .....	500.00	
Travel and Field Work .....	2,500.00	
Annual Meeting .....	200.00	
American Council on Education, Annual Dues .....	100.00	
CHRISTIAN EDUCATION Publication, Adv., etc. ....	3,500.00	
Miscellaneous (Inc. Bank fee of \$450 ins., etc.) .....	600.00	
Emergency—subject to action Executive Committee .....	300.00	
<b>TOTAL DISBURSEMENTS</b> .....	<b>\$26,823.32</b>	
Anticipated balance January 1 .....	1,542.52	
		<b>\$28,365.84</b>

October 1st, a surplus accumulated, held in anticipation of greater expenditures in this field later. The Council must be assured that unless our income is maintained or increased for 1930 we will be at once cutting into our accumulated capital and will be facing financial embarrassment.

One of the most important aspirations of the founders of the Council was to achieve a nation-wide publicity campaign for Christian education. When it came to actual accomplishment, however, it was discovered that three important difficulties were in the way: there was not at that time sufficient reliable data available for such a campaign; the institutions and agencies themselves were not worthy of indiscriminate and unqualified approval; and the cost of such a campaign was entirely prohibitive with the resources which the Council had at its command.

The Council began, therefore, to construct a stable foundation for extensive later publicity, engaging of course in some publicity from the very first. It was not willing, however, to commit itself to blind and partisan propaganda. Within the past dozen years certain really remarkable results have been achieved. To condense long chapters into single sentences they are:

1. A series of thoroughgoing fact-finding surveys.
2. A literature on Christian education remarkable in magnitude and quality.

\* For contribution to the first four items, see budget of the Association of American Colleges which shares the Council office and expends (1930) \$19,300.00 through the Council treasury.

3. A cooperative spirit which not only leaps over denominational lines but includes the great religious groups.

*Surveys.* It was the Council that made the first surveys of institutions and agencies affiliated with the churches, the pioneer work culminating in the American Education Survey of the Interchurch World Movement. In these early surveys the Council developed techniques of procedure which are in constant use. In more recent investigations it is developing new and revised techniques. It is a remarkable fact to which I have referred before, that in the field of strictly religious activities within the institutions, the Council in its survey work has worked almost single-handed. The United Lutheran survey is an exception to this statement. The survey published in the book, *Undergraduates*, while not made by the Council was inspired by the Council. The Carnegie Foundation in its recent report on intercollegiate athletics, which, because it brings fundamental questions of ethics to the attention of the colleges and the public, may fairly be listed among the documents of Christian education, mentions the Association of American Colleges first among those who asked for the survey.

*Literature on Christian Education.* To have carried out the original purpose of the Council in the field of publicity would have required an expenditure not merely of hundreds of thousands of dollars, but of millions of dollars. To send one sealed letter to the Protestant church members of the United States would cost a half million dollars for postage alone. The Council has been content, therefore, to adopt a much less ambitious procedure which has probably been at the same time more fruitful. The thirteen volumes of CHRISTIAN EDUCATION contain source material for publicity which cannot be duplicated elsewhere, and within these volumes also is to be found much of the literature itself on Christian education. The Council has not gone into the broadcasting business; it has furnished much data for broadcasting.

At this meeting there will be a display of publicity material on Christian education and on the colleges affiliated with the Boards, and publicity specialists are being invited to come here and make a study of this display. There will come before the

Council a proposition to issue occasional supplements to CHRISTIAN EDUCATION made up of the type of material which Mr. Stock is using with such signal success among the young people in the churches.

*The Cooperative Spirit.* Chiefly through the persistent courage and faith of the Council's former University Secretary—Dr. O. D. Foster—plans were formulated and agreed to which resulted in the cooperative activities of the Catholics, Jews and Protestants at the State University of Iowa and the University of California at Los Angeles. At the head of each of these enterprises is now a man trained and seasoned in the type of university religious work for which the Council has stood and to which Boards of the Council have contributed for years. The ideals and methods in operation at Iowa City and Los Angeles have been very generally approved, and during the past year intergroup conferences with the same general objectives in mind have been held by and at Columbia, Cornell and Harvard Universities. Within the past year a most interesting piece of cooperative work has been set up at Alfred University, a striking story of the accomplishments of which has already been given by President Davis.

While the Council has never been assigned administrative duties, it has been alert to developments and possibilities in this field. Those who are concerned for the fate of many small denominational colleges and wonder whether that fate is to be the same as that of multitudes of denominational academies, are observing with interest not only the rapidly developing junior colleges which the Federal Government is now planning to study and which both the Secretary of the Interior and the United States Commissioner of Education are actively fostering, but also the merging of colleges both among themselves and with neighboring universities which is now going on in several sections of the country. There are the Columbia Colleges, now four in number, the Harvard Colleges of which there are about twenty, the Atlanta Colleges to the number of three, the Claremont Colleges now three with a fourth projected, the Occidental Colleges. Some of these are achieved facts while others are in various states of incubation. No two of the groupings are on the same basis, no one is like the very successful Canadian system, but these proc-



esses of amalgamation carry with them important and significant lessons. Years ago the "Michigan Colleges" were envisioned by representatives of the Council merged into a paper unity under the leadership of Dr. E. D. Burton, and this year a hazy image has been formed of the "Piedmont Colleges" and the "Colleges of Southern California." A half dozen small colleges might well secure the benefit of the guidance and teaching of one great biologist, or linguist, or economist, or teacher of the Bible. The administrative and teaching values inherent in these evaluations when such are carried out unselfishly are hard to overestimate.

The Executive Secretary recommends that the staff be authorized this year, in addition to its other duties, to make a careful examination into conditions in our secondary schools and junior colleges and their relation to other schools of the same kind under state and private auspices.

*Conclusion.* The theme adopted this year for our annual meeting takes us right into the heart of Christian education's most acute dilemma. Liberty is a deep-seated Anglo-Saxon aspiration. Shall Christian education set her sons and daughters free? There is much to be said for the new—and the old—freedom. But our sons and daughters have other racial inheritances as well, besides the desire for freedom. The very theory of evolution of which we in academic circles are so proud and which registers an epochal achievement of science, is another expression for limitation and control. Let our youth reflect that science, of all things, and especially evolution, has been engaged in a pitiless deflation of the human ego. Science, too, is saying, "Be not wise in your own conceits." What type of necessary limitation and control, then, shall Christian education incorporate in its program?

To what extent shall we attempt to lead out what is in youth? To what extent attempt to teach what is in ourselves? Are these diametrically opposite movements? Or is youth part of ourselves, and we part of youth? Is there some mid-way station between paternalism and intellectual anarchy?

The churches are accused of educational malpractice. It is said that they are guilty of indoctrination, of dogmatism, of coercion. They perpetuate certain brands and interpretations of

truth by determining the thinking of inexperienced and unsuspecting youth.

To avoid this danger, then, shall Christian education become thoroughly objective? Shall it refuse to associate itself with or dissociate itself from the entire expressional side of religion? Shall it become a pure science? We are solemnly told that on the college level it should. Medical students, of course, need hospitals in their studies, law students need courts, engineering students need bridges and tunnels. But for Christian education there must be no laboratory work, no contacts with or utilization of churches or other mediums of religious expression!

Shall college students be allowed to develop keen appreciations and form personal attachments in literature and language, in biology and history, in social science and the fine arts, but be forcibly estopped from all entangling alliances when it comes to religion? Is religion only fit for a glass case in a museum?

Perhaps it may be said that Christian education aspires to lead the undergraduate into the ability to make discriminations. For this purpose he must have learned how to think and to do and to be what others before him have thought and done and been. But when he takes command of himself he must be able to disentangle himself from some of the lumber of heirlooms and heredity devices, and to turn others into tools for augmenting his power. As a free man he must move forward under the direction of his own personality, which, however, he discovers more and more, is compounded from within, from without, and from on High. In any event, we are to address ourselves at this annual meeting to the reciprocal functions of liberty and restraint.

May I assure you once again how much I appreciate the privilege of working, year after year, with the members of this Council and the efficient staff which the joint office has brought together. In the presence of a member of the staff I remarked a few days ago to a small group of men, one of whom was a member of the staff, that I believed there is no office group in New York City which works more intently for longer hours and, numbers considered, turns off more work—"and which," the staff member added, "enjoy their work more."

Such spontaneity and sincerity add immeasurably to the zest of Christian service.

## MODERN COLLEGE TRAINING AND DENOMINATIONAL LOYALTIES

### THE PRESIDENT'S ADDRESS

BOOTHE C. DAVIS, President of Alfred University

That the training of college men and women for effective intellectual leadership and community service is complicated, when the training of zealous denominational leaders is involved, can scarcely be doubted by any one who has seriously faced these responsibilities.

Are the two tasks consistent with each other? If so, how may they be kept consistent under changed, and changing conditions? These are questions which this program of the Council of Church Boards of Education has frankly set up for serious consideration at this meeting. To answer them constructively, if we can have the wisdom to do so, will be a major achievement.

This Council is composed of denominational Boards of Education, definitely appointed and consciously maintained as denominational agencies. It is our duty, in no small part, to promote the training of our youth to take up the tasks of the church in each of these respective denominations, and to carry forward the work and ideals of the fathers, set forth in the constitutions and creeds of our several branches of the church.

We cannot consistently ignore that task, in so far as it is itself consistent with sound education and the spirit of Christian brotherhood and cooperation of the age in which we live.

But the Boards of this Council are also charged with the responsibility of promoting and guiding a large and important group of educational institutions in this country. These colleges must set standards of liberal culture, norms of scholarship, and ideals for citizenship and public service in a century when all the world is a neighborhood, and all men are brothers and fellow citizens as never before.

These wider angled tasks of directing the new education to the ends of public service and good citizenship are just as truly laid upon us by our constituencies as are the more immediate and restricted tasks of training for church and denominational leadership.

The state is providing elementary, and for the most part secondary education. It is providing vocational schools, and in increasing numbers, junior colleges, with a trend toward industrial and vocational education.

State universities are developing a high degree of specialization, and with reference more and more to the vocations.

These trends of state supported education leave the privately supported colleges to occupy the center of the stage in liberal culture. Upon these colleges depends the answer of the future as to whether there shall continue to be "liberal culture." There are pessimists in the colleges and optimists for the state program who predict the early elimination of the liberal arts college as it is caught in the squeeze, between the upper and the nether millstones: viz., the departmentalized university above, and the vocationalized junior college beneath.

The Church Boards of Education are, however, the chosen guardians of hundreds of liberal arts colleges in which many millions of dollars are invested through the benevolence of church people, and into which hundreds of thousands of dollars are annually poured from the treasuries of churches.

If these colleges are to live to provide liberal culture to future generations, it will be because these Boards, cooperating through this Council, hold up a standard of culture and scholarship which shall command respect, and prove itself a conservator of spiritual values in an age which is mercenary and materialistic.

We must recognize, therefore, that there are the two distinct phases of the work of these Boards, and of the responsibility that is laid upon us.

First, we must maintain colleges with cultural ideals, standards of scholarship, and adequate equipment for making effective intellectual growth with freedom of initiative in thought and expression. In such colleges men must be led to think independently, to acquaint themselves with the sources of knowledge, and to form for themselves estimates of values. We cannot be satisfied with results less comprehensive, less thorough, less free.

The second responsibility is no less mandatory.

The church is largely dependent upon our Christian colleges for a trained, loyal and effective leadership. The recent investi-

gation of the Executive Secretary of this Council, published in the January issue of CHRISTIAN EDUCATION, under the title: "The Contribution of the Church Colleges to the Missionary Enterprise" leaves no doubt whatever on this point. From fifty to ninety per cent of the trained religious workers, ministers and missionaries, of our respective denominations come from these church colleges. Without these colleges the denominations know that their chief source of supply of workers would be dried up. It is for this reason that these colleges are established and supported. Without the hope and purpose of providing Christian leadership through the colleges, any incentive for churches to bestow their gifts on colleges is not different from the incentives to common philanthropy, or the good will of a cheerful taxpayer. But education which inculcates denominational interest and loyalty, which teaches men to think in approved forms, is in danger of degenerating into a process of telling men what to believe, rather than teaching them how to think for themselves.

The difference between education and propaganda is that the one teaches men *how* to think; the other tells them *what* to think. Our churches do not wish us to be propagandists; yet they wish loyalties encouraged. That the two ideals,—loyalty and scholarship, can be consistently achieved in the church supported colleges is the thesis of this paper, and the contention of this program of the Council of Church Boards of Education.

The foregoing is a brief and rather sketchy analysis of our problem as a Council of Church Boards of Education. I have tried to state the matter clearly and to lay it definitely upon our hearts.

We are somewhat like the United States Government in relation to the Court of International Justice. We believe in international good will and the peaceful settlement of international disputes. But national loyalties clamor to be safeguarded. Can the two interests be consistently domiciled in the same institution, viz, the World Court?

If I may speak for this Council, we believe they can. Furthermore, we believe that church and denominational loyalties

can be consistently domiciled with high scholarship and freedom of thought in the church fostered Christian college.

It will not be possible in the brief space allotted to the President's address to make a detailed discussion of the methods by which this can be done. Other papers and addresses will develop the details of this program far beyond the mere outline here attempted. But the following points may be noted:

### I. THE BACKGROUND OF CHRISTIAN EDUCATION

The background of Christian education begins with the home life of the child, if not with the home of his ancestors.

There is usually little that a college can do toward developing church or denominational loyalties if the student has not brought with him from his home and his home church a generous stock of such loyalties when he crosses the threshold of the college. The same is true in regard to loyalties of family or state or nation.

Given a youth with well grounded loyalties when he enters college, there is much in a sane educational program that is calculated to deepen and enrich them, in so far as they are not contradicted by evident truth and experience.

If "the family as a cultural unit does more toward the shaping of these characteristics that make an individual personal, and thus produce character, than any other functioning group in society," as Stewart G. Cole asserts, the loyalties which the family produces, must be the most permanent and abiding loyalties.

It is rather the function of the college, therefore, to preserve these loyalties, while adjusting them to new areas of truth, than to create such loyalties in minds previously devoid of them.

### II. CHANGES IN RELIGIOUS ATTITUDES OF STUDENTS DURING THEIR COLLEGE COURSE

There is a great diversity of opinion regarding the changes in religious beliefs produced by college training. These varied and often conflicting opinions are usually little more than assertions without any adequate basis of supporting data.

Helen Chambers Griffin published in *Religious Education* for February, 1929, a study, systematically made, of a group of thirty-three seniors of the Class of 1927 of Reed College.



From a large amount of data collected a few conclusions were drawn which seem of value in this discussion, because somewhat typical.

1. The more abstract the student's attitude upon entering college, the less likely is his attitude to be changed while in college. It appears that if the student has had adolescent religious training which has supplemented childhood's materialistic concepts of religion, and which gives him more abstract concepts, he is in less danger of losing his bearings and having his religious faith seriously altered.

2. Changes of attitude are already in progress when students finish high school and present themselves for admission to college. In other words important changes, harmful or otherwise, begin during the high school age, and only await college age and college freedom to find expression. If this is true the college cannot be charged with all the harm nor credited with all the good resulting from changed religious attitudes announced while in college.

3. College contributes to a constructive viewpoint, though broader, more than it does to a destructive viewpoint.

The enlightenments of college training effect a tolerant understanding of life and environment. A tolerant understanding is an experience. Such an experience of tolerant understanding is the best possible material for a constructive viewpoint. When the past, out of which the present has grown, is tolerantly and appreciatively understood, one's mind takes root in the institutions of society and we begin to be conscious of the nourishment they afford for present and future society. In this appreciation and re-evaluation of religion, the church and the denominations which have nourished us come in for their rightful share.

4. The view of the college professor is a powerful influence in causing students to re-examine their own beliefs. This is as evident, and as effective, in matters of religious attitude and loyalties as it is in relation to science, history, philosophy, etc. In all these changes in student attitude the college is an ally of the church.

### III. THE STUDENT MIND

A college student's mind exhibits the following characteristics:

1. The college mind gives full acceptance to the scientific

point of view. Authenticated facts are demanded. Proofs are substituted for traditions, sentiments and enthusiasms.

2. Student autonomy is growing in student consciousness. Problems of discipline are worked out cooperatively by student and faculty committees. A similar spirit of autonomy and co-operation is expected of religion and the church if loyalties are to be held. The church needs the college as colleague in working out this youth movement problem.

3. The college student is socially minded. He is increasingly conscious of social responsibility. He has a keen sense of justice. As he loves truth, he loves justice and fair play. If his loyalties to religion and the church are to be held he must feel in them the impact of a social program, and must see in them the opportunity for the effective expression of the social feeling and insights that challenge him.

Here, again, in all these elements of the student mind, the college is an ally of the church.

No better training ground can be found for the church than the college, where these elements of the student mind can be conserved and led into constructive thinking.

This paper may seem to lack the convincing arguments or dogmatic statements demanded by ultra-denominational or sectarian loyalties. I can not hope, neither do I believe the approved or standard liberal arts college can hope to meet the extreme demands of a narrow sectarianism.

In the foregoing analysis and arguments I have endeavored to show that the colleges of this Council may be, and indeed are the allies of the home and the church in conserving and developing those loyalties which the home and the church most need and most prize; viz., the spirit of service through the agency of the church.

That the college can not be expected to create loyalties; but only to uncover, stimulate, liberate, liberalize, and inspire such loyalties as exist, even though dormant in the mind of the student when he enters college, is frankly admitted.

Changes in religious attitude begin before college days in most young people. They are less pronounced when previous training has been such as to supply the more abstract concepts of

religion, and to free the mind from the materialistic concepts of childhood and an unscientific teaching.

But colleges, more often than otherwise, contribute to a constructive viewpoint; and this in proportion to the richness of mind of the teacher, in religious thought and experience.

The college student's mind accepts the scientific point of view. His out-reaching for autonomy and for the privilege of social service, makes the college the best ally of the church in training a man for effective work within the ranks of his own denomination.

#### IV. COOPERATIVE RELIGIOUS ACTIVITY IN COLLEGE AND ITS EFFECT UPON DENOMINATIONAL LOYALTIES

In concluding this discussion, I wish to refer to the influence of cooperative religious activity on the college campus.

At the present time our groups of students are never limited to any one denomination.

Indeed it seldom, if ever, occurs that a majority of the students on any campus are of any one denomination. More and more it is true that student bodies are composed of representatives of a great many denominations. It not infrequently happens that the denomination with which a college is affiliated has fewer of its own members within its student body, than of various other denominational groups represented in the enrolment. Under these circumstances some cooperative religious activity becomes necessary in even church colleges. No instance has come to my attention in which such cooperative activity has been supposed to reduce the denominational loyalty of either the affiliated group, or of any other group. There is abundant evidence that cooperative religious activity in independent and state supported institutions generates denominational loyalties.

The replies in Dr. Kelly's investigation, previously mentioned, bear clear witness to a helpful percentage of Christian workers from independent or tax supported institutions, though the majorities in varying percentages come from the church colleges.

Wherever a strong religious interest is created in any group, denominational loyalties grow naturally out of an awakened spirituality. Cooperative religious activity in state supported in-

stitutions can never have a sectarian aim or method. But it is nevertheless true, that constructive faith and united religious activity energize the loyalties that have been inoperative, and in the background. They naturally come into consciousness and assert themselves with awakened spiritual interest.

This is what W. B. Hammond and Dean Inge call "religious feeling or consciousness" as a source of authority, arising from the residuum of childhood's teaching and impressions, after adolescent doubts, protests and storms have cleared away. "The critical period does not destroy religious beliefs though it may change them almost beyond recognition. As we emerge into mature life we find the religious instruction of an earlier age reappearing in the form of religious feeling, which no reasoning can destroy."

The "tolerant understanding" of a widening college horizon, and the new impact of religious contacts "tunes in" on religious consciousness, and on denominational loyalties heretofore latent and unobservable.

A spiritually minded church in any community will beget interest and loyalties in other churches in that community. Likewise wherever religious interests are awakened within college groups of various churches and denominations, the individuals of such groups experience quickened loyalties toward the church which in earlier years has sowed the good seed of religion within the soul. There are doubtless exceptions; but the rule holds true. Statistics of denominational leaders recruited from state universities where a strong cooperative religious leadership has been maintained, support this statement.

An interesting illustration of this recurring loyalty through cooperative religious interest has appeared in my own college the present year.

In September, last, we installed a student pastor under the cooperative support of various leading Protestant denominations, and through the encouragement of the University Committee of this Council. We were fortunate in obtaining a very excellent man. A distinctly new religious interest has been awakened on the campus. Voluntary chapel attendance has greatly increased. Attendance at Sunday morning worship has doubled.

Not long since a group of Catholic students invited the Student Pastor to advise them in the matter of organizing a Catholic Club. He cheerfully complied, and we now have this Catholic Club with our Presbyterian student pastor as their advisor.

A few days later a group of Hebrew students came to this same Student Pastor and asked his advice and help in organizing them into a fraternal club.

These awakened loyalties seem to be the direct result of an awakened cooperative religious interest among Protestants on the campus.

It is not so easy to differentiate the awakened loyalties among the Protestant groups themselves. But I have no doubt whatever that there are denominational loyalties asserting themselves among Methodists, Presbyterians, Baptists, and other groups sharing this awakened cooperative religious interest on our campus.

Without following the discussion further, I repeat again that it seems to me entirely consistent to build and strengthen liberal arts colleges, with the highest ideals of scholarship; and at the same time to encourage, enrich, and develop loyalties in denominational groups which will be of the highest service to these denominations and to the world.

Our success in this two-fold task will depend most of all upon the personnel of administration and teaching forces in our colleges and universities.

---

**P**RESIDENT HERBERT HOOVER and Dr. Julius Klein, Assistant Secretary of Commerce, have personally endorsed an Institute of Paper Chemistry to be established at Lawrence College, Appleton, Wisconsin, as a graduate school for the training of chemists in the pulp and paper industry.

**T**HE COLLEGE FOR WOMEN, Western Reserve University, announces the successful completion of their \$1,000,000 endowment fund campaign. Mr. E. S. Harkness made a gift of \$100,000 conditional on \$900,000 being raised elsewhere.

**T**HE TENTH ANNUAL CONFERENCE OF THE PROGRESSIVE EDUCATION ASSOCIATION will be held at the Hotel Willard, Washington, D. C., April 3, 4, and 5, 1930.

## NEW THINGS ARE NOT SO IMPORTANT AS TRUE THINGS

### REPORT OF THE SECRETARY ON FINANCIAL AND FIDUCIARY MATTERS

ALFRED WILLIAMS ANTHONY

New things are not so important as true things. Novelty may charm, but it must lose its charm soon; and it will lose all its charm and force, if it be not based on sound principles, which are workable in both old and new conditions.

Those who, like ourselves, are busied with the creation of financial structures, which will stand four-square and solid through long reaches of time, when novelty has worn off, have greater reason to think clearly and build soundly than to scintillate and shine with brilliant and novel devices. I conceive it chiefly my task to assemble out of the experience of the past and out of the clearest thinking of our ablest financiers, who now administer affairs and are looking into the future, the methods and principles which will endure the test of time.

For four full years this Secretary on Financial and Fiduciary matters, although without the portfolio, has reported at each annual meeting and has presented articles in each issue of CHRISTIAN EDUCATION, month by month through the four years. At the same time, in similar fields of activity, he has been the means of calling together and directing five major conferences and innumerable lesser conferences of experts and persons interested in the field of charity and finance. The men assembled would not claim to have the last word to speak, either in experience or in wisdom, and little would they like to be called "experts," but others would so term them, because they are thoroughly seasoned in the ways of trial and practice, and are alert and keen-minded, with visions into the future.

Out of these five conferences have issued five separate booklets, containing views presented and conclusions arrived at in the conferences. These booklets and other printed matter, to an estimated number of more than 200,000 copies, have been circulated through the mails and by hand amongst a variety of



thoughtful people. To think of the different groups of these people and the numbers of them, though in general terms, will stimulate the imagination to grasp something of the wide reach of the circles ever widening, which may be started, as by a little pebble in the mill-pond, by a clear utterance in any realm of human interest.

The people touched by our printed words have included practically the entire sweep of the missionary and educational boards of the church; this means home and foreign mission societies and educational boards of the different denominations in our country. Practically all of the trust company officials have been reached through their own publications, which have carried reports of our utterances before some of their annual meetings, and through the distribution of pamphlets. A large proportion of the life insurance underwriters of the country have had their attention attracted to the possibility of serving educational, religious and other charitable organizations as they are promoting their own business through the selling of insurance policies for future benefits of individuals. To a considerable proportion of the lawyers of the country has been offered the opportunity, through their technical journals, to become acquainted more intimately with the needs and the methods of serving their clients in the devotion of wealth to charitable purposes. To more than 2200 millionaires and multimillionaires of the country, a selected list of our publications has been sent.

It is, of course, impossible to affirm that any deep or lasting impression has been made upon all of these people, but by the constant dripping of the drop even a stone may be worn away, and by the constant hitting of the nail upon the head the nail may be driven home, so by frequent repetition, with turns of phrases and on fresh occasions, impressions may be made upon even the most obtuse, and the most indifferent minds. Allowing the greatest possible discount as to results, it is undoubtedly safe to say that impressions have been carried to a large number of people and have made permanent lodgment covering the following three particulars:—

(1) Charitable organizations are progressive; they are not dead; they do not stand still; they are more determinedly than

ever before managing themselves with alert and wise attention to details, and they command the confidence of men who examine them, whether in law, in finance or in charity, under a scrutiny which may be termed technical, scientific and thorough. In other words, there has come to pass something of a consciousness that in the possession and in the administration of endowment and trust funds we not only must be good housekeepers but that we have already largely become good housekeepers. If any institution here represented has not sound administrative methods in its treasurer's office, in its controller's office, in its president's office (so far as the president has to do with funds) or in any department of its financial structure, that institution should be now warned to put its house in order, even if it means the entire reconstruction of the ways in which it receives funds, receipts for funds, deposits funds, enters funds on its books, invests its funds, cares for its investment securities, reviews, scrutinizes, re-invests, amortizes and in any way handles and administers its funds. Ancient methods, though they may have worked well hitherto, should, from time to time, be examined with an open mind and with a readiness to adopt better methods which experience may have revealed.

We are saying to the world that we are earnest about this thing of keeping breast-up with the best knowledge and the best experience in finance. Some of us are efficient in the handling of funds. All of us aim at efficiency. We must become efficient. We are making the impression of a great awakening in financial and fiduciary efficiency.

(2) We have set forth with clearness and considerable stress, the fact that we *believe in cooperation* and *are working cooperatively*. We have spoken not as single institutions but as groups, and yet not in detached groups, each distinct and by itself, the home mission group by itself, the foreign mission group by itself, the social workers group by itself, the hospital and health group by itself, the educational group by itself and the national religious groups by themselves,—we have spoken with a united voice and with a united front as charitable organizations of all kinds, and we have been heard more nearly as a unit. In effect, we have said that while we are different in administrative pur-

poses we are alike in our financial needs, we are alike in the honesty with which we administer finance, alike in fidelity to trusts and to contracts and in efficiency as almoners and distributors of the donations and bequests with which we are entrusted. It is a great message to give to the world, that things which *are* common we see as common, and that, learning from each other's experiments, we are adopting the best conclusions out of the richest and ripest experience of us all.

We have held conferences attended by religious men and educational men, by social workers and trust company officials, by lawyers and bankers, by Catholics and Jews as well as by Protestant Christians. Our conferences have been inclusive; and this inclusiveness has spoken its unmistakable message. Whether we know it or not, by these conferences and by the output of booklets and publications, we have been saying to the whole world that, when it comes to receiving and administering money, there is no such thing as a *sectarian* method of finance, no such thing as a *denominational* or an *educational* policy of integrity and honesty, no such thing as a *religious* type of expertness, and that there is no such thing as efficiency and investment in sound securities peculiarly characterized by the sanctity of custom or by the supposed sanctity of profession. If there is honesty at all, it is honesty; if there is integrity at all, it is integrity; if there is efficiency at all, it is efficiency, and if there is wisdom, it is wisdom, whether the finances involved are for Jew, Catholic or for Protestant Christian, for a college, for a missionary board, for a hospital, or for a great denomination. We are after wisdom; we respect wisdom; we do not mean to fool ourselves with sectarianism, or sectionalism, or with anything which is partial and one-sided.

We are saying to all the world that by the means of the conferences which we hold we are trying to put financial structures on sound financial foundations. We have shown our spirit of cooperation in other ways, in broad and inclusive ways, recognizing that we should dispense funds for human welfare whatever the technical method and form, in cooperation with large possessors of wealth, offering trained and experienced service as almoners and dispensers of the wealth which they hold for the

benefit of mankind. We have recognized the fact that the legal profession almost from time immemorial has been cooperating with us and we with them, as they form and phrase the documents which have conveyed titles and turned over property and stipulated obligations and pointed out and required such and such uses for such and such purposes. We and they cooperate together as they write wills and we at length become the beneficiaries thereunder and later trustees and administrators. We recognize the fact that the great structures of life insurance, the marvel of the last half century, have been built up wholly as a provision for future need, and through the past almost exclusively for individuals and families and private purposes. But now we are saying and the life insurance companies are saying, that it is as legitimate to use these methods, reaching into the future, for the benefit of charities, when conditions and purposes are appropriate. We are saying also, more clearly than ever before, that the banking institutions of the world, serving in a marvelous and now indispensable way as depositors of wealth, can serve us as we also can serve them, and that there are innumerable ways by which we should have cooperated, and yet closer and more intimate ways through which we may cooperate with mutual advantage and increasing benefit to society at large and to the particular institutions which we represent.

As we recognize the possibility of more intimate cooperation between the five groups named,—givers, administrators, lawyers, insurance men and trust company officials and bankers, we realize the need of simple and understandable methods of cooperation. We do not wish thousands or millions of trust agreements if one will suffice. We have become the exponents of one single, standardized trust agreement, prepared by probably the best living authority upon wills and trusts. This one document is capable of serving all the charitable purposes of any individual for any object which he may have in mind, in any place, either where he may live or to which he may wish his benefaction to extend. By this single instrument we are in a position to recommend one contractual agreement respecting trusts for charities instead of requiring the writing of scores and hundreds and thousands and even millions of separate trust agreements for the

multitude of trust transactions which are taking place. If there is anything more cooperative or more simple than that, I wish someone would say what it is. One standardized trust agreement, known as The Uniform Trust for Public Uses, is capable of serving every trustor, whoever his trustee may be, if the trustee will qualify under that agreement, for any object, anywhere in this or any other country. For my own part, I offer no apology whatever for having been convinced that this method of a standardized trust agreement is a sound method and as the years pass will be justified by the wisdom of the years. It is simple because it is one, and serves the purpose of innumerable and confusing variety.

We have today the following list of banks and trust companies which have adopted The Uniform Trust for Public Uses:—

Maine, Lewiston—Lewiston Trust Company

“ Manufacturers' National Bank

Massachusetts, Boston—Old Colony Trust Company

New York, New York City—The Bank of New York and Trust Company

Yonkers—First National Bank

“ Westchester Trust Company

New Jersey, Montclair—Montclair Trust Company

Illinois, Springfield—First State Trust and Savings Bank

Iowa, Keokuk—Keokuk Trust Company

Sioux City—Farmers Loan and Trust Company

Minnesota, Duluth—American Exchange National Bank

Missouri, St. Louis—Mercantile Exchange National Bank

Ohio, Springfield—First National Bank and Trust Company

Portland, Oregon—Security Savings and Trust Company

This document, though prepared by an individual, has to my knowledge been examined by the legal advisers of practically all of the large missionary boards, home and foreign, of the country, and was so examined when the document was in process of construction. It has also been examined by innumerable lawyers connected with banks and trust companies, connected with colleges and charities of every form, and has been pronounced by them legally sound and valid.

One objection, deemed serious by some, and one only, so far as I know, has been raised against the document, or against its use, and that is that it is copyrighted and use of it must be se-

cured by license and by paying a license fee. It is copyrighted. Were it not copyrighted, it would never remain the same and would cease to be a standard document as soon as it became varied. An individual is the owner of the copyright. He is the man who produced the document, who has spent the ripest years of his life in its production and expended I know not how much but considerable sums of money in its preparation. Who should hold title to the plan if not he? Should he make a gift of this document to the trustees who, as trustees, are to receive as commissions compensation for doing business under the document? He is not a rich man. Should the rich corporations which will benefit most by the use of his labors pay him nothing? Should they be treated as a charity? Should he or any one else make a contribution to them? I have always considered it equitable and just that he should receive compensation for his labor, and that the trust companies in proportion to their expected use of the document should make a modest payment for its use. The charge for the use of this document averages about \$50 for every million dollars of capital and surplus which a trust company possesses, and the right to use the document is in perpetuity, or as nearly so as present laws and present guarantees allow and confirm.

The value of a standardized form of trust agreement lies largely in the fact that persons of the greatest wealth have begun to show distinct preference for the services of a trustee such as trust companies may be, with which they are acquainted, whose strength and stability they regard as assured, and who are not themselves interested as beneficiaries of the trust.

The Uniform Trust for Public Uses makes provision for wise and reasonable changes in the use of funds held thereunder as conditions in the future change. There is a growing consciousness that the wisdom of today is not adequate for all time, and that requirements imposed today must be subject to adaptation and change. Otherwise, grotesque and almost tragic inconsistencies will occur, as they have thus far in the experience of men, of ways in which the grip of the dead hand limits wisdom and blights good purposes because altered circumstances make the "ancient good" uncouth. Givers-of-the-long-reach believe in



*posthumous discretion* and desire to make the provision for it as soon as they discover how best it can be done. The Uniform Trust for Public Uses has provision for posthumous discretion embodied within it.

(3) We have begun to recognize the value of variety and flexibility, as applied to givers and the methods they may use. I cannot say that we have gone far in this direction, for it is a difficult thing on the part of many people to believe that there is more than one way of being correct and more than one method that will accomplish a good result. But, nevertheless, we are beginning to recognize certain values in variation and adaptation. For example, if a man living in New York desires to benefit a college in Ohio, and if that man in New York has become accustomed to carrying on all of his money transactions through the medium of one bank, and if he then should desire to make his bank trustee of his posthumous benefaction so that his property would remain in the same hands which had handled it throughout his life, and the earning of his property should be sent to Ohio, we have begun to see that the institution in Ohio, which can use only the earnings of the fund, is just as well off not to have the fund of money itself, indeed, is perhaps better off not to have it, since only the income can be expended; and so we have begun to recognize the propriety of what might be called dissociated, or separate, trustees, and non-local trust funds, or distributed trusts in many localities, the incomes of which may be brought together at any given place according as the trustors may have decreed. Into the minds of some of us, then, it has begun to dawn that diversity of trusteeships may be positively of great value, and that at least the presence of the principal of a trust is not necessary when only the income of the trust can be expended for an educational or a charitable purpose.

We are beginning, some of us at least, to recognize that there must be flexibility in the methods employed by different generous people. Our old way was to pass a hat around and say "put in your money" and if they did not put the money in, then we thought we never would have it. We do recognize now that the hat is not the only method. We know that some people can put aside out of the current funds a little payment annually, or semi-

annually, which may, as under a life insurance policy, build up a considerable sum during a term of years to benefit, at a later time, a charitable object. This method, of course, defers the date of benefit, but it does not take away the certainty of benefit, nor the desirability of securing funds in accordance with that method, for that is the method which fits some persons who wish to use it and whose money is concerned in the transaction.

We know that a living trust may be used by a person of means, small or great, for almost any conceivable object as far as the income of it is concerned. If put into the hands of a trustee, the trust may be revoked and the principal shifted into other places or for whatever purposes. The income may benefit the trustor or the trustor's wife, or children, or somebody else. It may, in whole, benefit such and such an one, named, or in part benefit such and such an one, and the other part be used for a school, or college, or church, or other organization. It can begin its benefit now, while the trustor is living, or at the time of his death, or at a specified time following his death. It may continue its benefit forever, or its benefit may be limited to five years, or fifty years, or other periods of time. It may be held perpetually with restrictions upon the principal sum, or, after a lapse of time, the principal may be used for the charity itself or for other specified purposes, all at once or in certain percentages through a term of years.

Some of us have begun to recognize the great varieties of needs and desires and plans and purposes which may be embodied in living trusts with the assurance that everything as desired and proposed, if it be specified, will be carried out according to the stipulations expressed. We have begun to recognize, also, that under a will, trusts may be established with a great variety of adaptation to the trustor's desires and plans.

We are, therefore, becoming, let me say, more flexibly-minded, minded so as to recognize variety and adaptation and flexibility, which means, in effect, that we are becoming less insistent upon having a thing done in our precise way, or just as it was done yesterday by somebody, and of allowing the person who wishes to do the thing, to discover the method which corresponds most exactly with his wishes, and we are getting into a position where

we can tell him all the instruments and the ways to use them which will precisely represent the thing which corresponds to his situation and his purposes.

I think, therefore, that today I have a report full of significance when I say that during the last five years we have begun to make a distinct impression upon ourselves and upon others as to these three things:—

*First.* We are faithful and honest and are seeking efficiency in the administration of funds.

*Second.* We believe in cooperation. We are cooperative; we cooperate amongst ourselves and with all others who are at all minded as we are and are seeking to promote the things which we are seeking to promote.

*Third.* We believe in and practice flexibility, variation, adaptations, to fit circumstances and conditions in promoting the good which mankind needs.

We have learned some things which can be set down in sentences.

*A gift to charity is best, when unconditioned.* Then its use may be immediate or deferred, in part for current expenditures, or for capital investment, or for endowment; its benefits depend wholly upon the wisdom of the management.

*All gifts should not be for current funds;* were they, then progress would be difficult, if not impossible, because advancement arises out of the accumulation of capital through savings from current expenses.

*Nor should all gifts be to permanent funds.* No one accumulation of itself has any charitable value. Expenditure puts charity into practice. Funds must be used in order to accomplish good.

*Wisdom, therefore, in wise discrimination is needful for useful charity.* Judicious preparations between present and future needs, between present and future uses, between obligations resting upon men today and obligations which should rest upon men tomorrow, though difficult to determine, must be at least estimated as correctly as possible. Charitable giving, therefore, becomes more and more a matter of careful discrimination.

*Ordinarily the trustee should not be at the same time beneficiary of a trust. Self-interest tends to blind discernment.*

*As for giving, givers must be the final judges of their gifts. Even if some folly follows, givers must decide both the amount of the property which they give, and as to the methods by which they give, and as to the objects for which they give. We must not seek to cajole them or to coerce them. We should seek to enlighten and inform them. Wise public giving involves patient and long-continued instruction by those who have modesty enough, discernment enough and wisdom enough within themselves to teach without dogmatism.*

*Discretion should attend giving all the way through unto its final conclusion. People yet to come will have wisdom; generation after generation must exercise its own judgment in its own day. The Divine Wisdom in making the greatest gifts of all employs neither coercion nor restriction. Wisdom grows through experience. This day must not tie other days helplessly to the judgment of today.*

*Giving is the expression of a keen sense of responsibility in stewardship and service.*

*They who administer the gifts of others become partners in the enterprises of benevolent devotion and consecration.*

*Serving mankind because of the gifts of others and for the sake of living souls, is a high calling and a holy ministry.*

*In such service are we engaged. Let us see to it that we sanctify ourselves thereunto.*

---

#### THE BATES COLLEGE CHAPEL

Unfortunately it was discovered too late to make the correction in the February issue of CHRISTIAN EDUCATION, that a cut of the Rollins Chapel, Dartmouth, had been inserted in place of that of the Bates College Chapel, page XXVIII. We wish to express our regret and to call attention to the fact that a cut of the beautiful Bates Chapel appears in the March issue of the Association of American Colleges BULLETIN (Volume XVI, No. 1, page 137). For the story of the Dartmouth chapel see page 424 of this issue. *M. T. B.*

## THE NINETEENTH ANNUAL MEETING OF THE COUNCIL OF CHURCH BOARDS OF EDUCATION

RAYMOND H. LEACH

The nation's capital was the place chosen for the nineteenth annual meeting of the Council of Church Boards of Education. Here at the Willard Hotel which is the rendezvous for many organizations holding conferences, some one hundred representatives of denominational Boards of Education, their Executive Secretaries and many visitors interested in religious education assembled on January 13-14, 1930.

Dr. Robert L. Kelly, the Executive Secretary of the Council, has the happy faculty of selecting a theme which is at the time challenging the particular attention of those most interested in religious education—this year it being "Shall Christian education attempt to lead students to think, and to teach them what to think?" Seldom has a topic been chosen which was so apropos or which occasioned such interested thought and discussion.

The opening address given by President Boothe C. Davis on "Modern College Training and Denominational Loyalties" dealt with a subject of impelling interest to those having in their charge hundreds of colleges in which Christian people have invested and are still investing millions of dollars. Dr. Davis pointed out a two-fold responsibility of these colleges—first, the maintaining of cultural ideals, standards of scholarship and freedom of thought, and, secondly, the training of from fifty to ninety per cent of our denominational ministers, missionaries and other religious workers. President Davis maintained that colleges more often than otherwise give students a constructive viewpoint, the extent to which this is true depending upon the religious thought and experience of the instructor.

The report of the Executive Secretary, Dr. Robert L. Kelly, analyzed the theme as only Dr. Kelly can do. The necessity for the church in any program of Christian education was emphasized. Dr. Kelly called attention to the fact that whereas the study of medicine, law and engineering necessitates laboratory

practice, yet in the judgment of some critics of religious education no emphasis should be laid upon the need of the church for other medium of religious expression. This contention he combatted earnestly.

Dr. Alfred W. Anthony who has rendered such signal service to the Council as Financial Secretary, gave a most interesting address on the basis of cooperation between colleges seeking endowments and banks and trust companies seeking trusteeship of endowments. Dr. Anthony stressed the fact that it is becoming increasingly prevalent for those possessed of great wealth to look to their lawyers, bankers and trust companies as agents for the giving of large sums for philanthropic purposes. He stated that the eligibility of an institution depends upon its financial integrity and advised college executives who are interested in being considered for a gift or trust fund to put their houses in order financially.

Dr. H. O. Pritchard, Chairman of the Standing Committee on Colleges, pointed out in his report that the changes which have taken place in recent years have been so many and so far-reaching that we are faced with the task of formulating a new apologetic which can be maintained in the presence of the new situation.

Dr. William S. Bovard in the report of the Committee on Religious Education called the attention of those responsible for Christian teaching today, to four outstanding dangers as seen by Dr. H. H. Horne, of New York University:

1. A God without transcendence—an extremely humanistic conception of God.
2. A religion without Christ at the center.
3. A religion without external authority.
4. A religion without personal immortality.

Among the outstanding needs Dr. Horne suggests the treatment of religious education from the Christian standpoint, the need of teachers concerned with the life of the student rather than the subject, a technique of mysticism, and a realization that man is something more than a biochemical entity.

Dr. George R. Baker, Chairman of the University Committee, spoke of the need of a unified approach to all campus religious



effort. "Institutionalism, misunderstanding, or anything else that stands in the way of cooperation," said Dr. Baker, "must give way, that we may be in a better position to minister to the students in our universities."

That there is no real reason for being especially pessimistic regarding the present status of religion in our universities was maintained by Dr. Milton C. Towner in his excellent paper on that subject. It is felt by Dr. Towner that there are grounds for hope in the growth of the number of university pastors, the establishment of schools of religion, and particularly in the increasing number of faculty members who are becoming student-centered rather than content-centered in their interest.

One of the most animated discussions of the entire meeting was on the subject "The Place and Function of the Church Boards of Education and of the Council." Because of the greatly changed conditions in the educational field of church colleges, the change in program and personnel of many of the Church Boards of Education, and the new problems of the Boards it was felt by Dr. William Chalmers Covert, who spoke first on this topic, that a study commission should be appointed to carefully review the whole situation of the several Church Boards of Education and their relation to the Council and other cooperative agencies.

During the informal discussion by different members of the Council and in the summary by Dr. Frank W. Padelford, the many contributions which have been made by the Council to the cause of religious education and to the cause of higher education generally were brought out.

On Monday evening the topic of the meeting was "How may the institutions and agencies of the churches meet the two-fold task set forth in the general theme of this meeting?"

Dr. N. J. Gould Wickey, Executive Secretary, Board of Education of the United Lutheran Church in America, handled the subject adequately in his paper. Dr. Wickey called attention to the fact that we do not find college students thinking through their scientific problems and why should we expect them to think through their religious problems? It was stated by Dr. Wickey as had been stated by so many other speakers that the teacher is

the crux of the whole educational process as to its success or its failure. If he is to exert the influence which he should on his students then "there must be in his own life an exaltation of the Christ."

Dr. William S. Bovard in summarizing the discussion said he believed with Glenn Frank that "We live ourselves into right thinking more often than we think ourselves into right living."

The Rev. Gardiner M. Day, Assistant Rector, St. John's Protestant Episcopal Church, Williamstown, Mass., and Mr. Martyn D. Keeler, a student in Union Theological Seminary, New York, in their papers dealt with the theme, "May a student movement be created which will lead students to think and guide them in their thinking?" Both of these gentlemen, as well as Dr. M. Willard Lampe, Director of the Iowa School of Religion, who gave the summary of the discussion, agreed that a student movement is already in existence and that the only way it can increase is for all religious agencies to cooperate and to make the personality and teachings of Jesus Christ the driving force.

Probably the greatest single session of the week was the Union Mass Meeting held on Tuesday afternoon. The theme of this meeting was "The Place of Religion in American Higher Education," the speakers being President Avery A. Shaw, Denison University, Rev. Samuel M. Shoemaker, Jr., Rector, Calvary Protestant Episcopal Church, New York City and Bishop William F. McDowell, Methodist Episcopal Church, Washington, D. C. President Shaw dealt with the subject from the standpoint of one who has had experience as an executive of a college where religion is an important factor. Mr. Shoemaker advocated the conversion of many faculty members to God, because it is necessary for the faculty to "tackle" the question of character education from the point of view of one who has had a personal experience, and personal religion must begin with the life of the faculty member himself. Bishop McDowell held that Christian education is something more than giving a student such training as may be given under Christian influences. It is the task of "making the mind of the world according to the mind of Christ." All the efforts of every college should be devoted to the creation of Christian personalities in order that

the world's activities and enterprises may not get beyond the world's personalities.

The program of the nineteenth annual meeting of the Council of Church Boards of Education was built around the subject which is the most challenging of any yet faced by educators. Probably few left this meeting who were not thinking as Robert E. Lee thought and said when he came to take the presidency of Washington University, "If I do not lead my boys to Christ, I fail."

---

## REPORT OF THE UNIVERSITY COMMITTEE

GEORGE R. BAKER, Chairman

Only a member of the University Committee can understand how greatly the Committee has been changed by the retirement of Dr. M. Willard Lampe as Chairman, and the resignation of Dr. O. D. Foster as Secretary. It meets but three times a year, so that in a great measure these two men have been the Committee, though they were always eager to carry out policies worked out by the group in its infrequent sessions. We recognize the large service they have rendered and we gird ourselves to conserve that which they built up.

There are three new members of the University Committee: Dr. W. L. Young, the successor of Dr. Lampe on the Committee, and University Secretary of the Presbyterian Church U. S. A., who brings fresh contact with the conduct of student work, both as university pastor and as dean of a School of Religion, Dr. Milton C. Towner, President of the National Association of Church Workers at Universities, and Miss Jean Dayton, of the Baptist Board of Education.

The most significant addition, however, is the coming of Mr. Raymond H. Leach, formerly Dean of Men of the University of Nevada, as Secretary. In the September meeting of the Committee, he was unanimously recommended to the Executive Committee of the Council for the position which he now holds. He was elected and in October began his work, immediately seeking contacts with the field. His first five visits were to typical pieces of university pastor work. He visited the University of Pennsyl-

vania where a federation of churches and other organizations is the correlating agency; East Lansing, where an interdenominational church gathers under its auspices the various forms of work with students; the University of Iowa, where a school of religion is the unifying agency, every organization and activity desiring Dr. Lampe's counsel and leadership; and the University of Illinois, where no correlation organization is recognized but where brethren dwell and work together in unity. He then visited the University of Chicago where the University itself has recognized its responsibility for the religious life of the students and as a university attempts to function in ways that will meet students' manifold spiritual needs. Mr. Leach has also visited a number of other institutions. He has proven himself as a tireless worker, a keen observer, and a man of deep sympathy with students.

There is little of change to record in regard to our university pastor work. The method seems approved, the genius of each denomination manifesting itself through the type of work which it is furthering.

A real change has, however, taken place at Cornell University. The old federation of the Cornell University Christian Association and the Protestant churches has been succeeded by an interconfessional council, on which there are represented Protestants, Roman Catholics and Jews. This new alignment will be watched with interest. We trust that its program will be the greatest common multiple and not the least common divisor.

The Committee is conscious that it represents but one type of religious effort at the universities. There must be a unified approach. Some of us have had this on our hearts through the years. We sing "Like a mighty army moves the Church of God" where, as a matter of fact, we move in platoons and squads and corporal guards. Institutionalism, misunderstanding, or anything else that stands in the way of cooperation, must give way that we may be in a better position to minister to the students in our universities.

I have asked Mr. Leach to speak of his own work. His statement will constitute a part of this report.

## REPORT BY MR. LEACH

Your Associate and University Secretary took over on October 1, 1929, the position left vacant by the resignation of Dr. O. D. Foster, and has therefore been in your service just 105 days, a period hardly sufficient to justify a so-called report, but it is fit and proper that there should be rendered an accounting of his stewardship even for this short period.

The first month was spent in the New York office getting oriented and meeting people whom one engaged in this work should know. During this time, the counsel and advice of Dr. Kelly and Dr. Baker were invaluable. Owing to the growing importance of Young People's Summer Conferences in the minds of denominational leaders and others, Dr. Kelly suggested the gathering together of all possible information on this subject. This is still in process.

On December 30, 31, 1929, and January 1, 1930, I attended the Conference of Church Workers in Universities of the North Central Region held at the University of Illinois, the theme of which was: "The Experience and Technique of Church Workers in Colleges and Universities."

On January 4, 1930, I attended in New York a conference of the representatives of the organizations supporting the Student in Industry Movement.

In order to become acquainted with the several types of religious work being done among students on university campuses, a visit was made to the University of Pennsylvania, where there is being carried on a pioneer piece of cooperative work; to Michigan State College, where the church is the cooperating agency for four denominations which largely support the enterprise; to the University of Illinois, where effective results are being accomplished but where individualism is strong; to the University of Iowa, where the new school of religion is the coordinating agency; to the University of Chicago, where the institution itself has assumed the responsibility of determining the general policy governing the moral and religious activities of the University; to Iowa State Teachers College, where there is a desire on the part of the administration for the establishment of some sort of cooperative religious work.

The church representatives in the field showed every consideration, while the university authorities at the several institutions evidenced a deep interest in what we are trying to accomplish in a religious way in their institutions.

The experience gathered during my years on the faculty of a state university has been very valuable to me in many ways even thus early in my work for the Council.

*Program.* Those best acquainted with campus life know not only the value but the necessity of being selective in the items of a program because of the demands made upon the time and energies of students. There is danger of planning too extensive a program and having it mostly on paper. Harry Thomas Stock, who is making a special study of this whole subject, concludes that all a university pastor can do is "to make some contact with the most serious of student needs and to develop a few phases of a program which will leave some fruitage in Christian character."

However, there is one campus group too often disregarded in our religious work plans, and that is the faculty. Yet they are the permanent group and, in a large measure, make the college what it is. State universities cannot make a requirement that their faculty members have an active interest in religious life and service, but many of them have such an interest and others might be interested if a little more attention were paid to them by our church workers. Furthermore, it would mean much for the success of our work if more faculty men were brought into the scheme of things.

*Council Office a Bureau of Information re Technique.* Our university religious work is a new field of endeavor and a technique is being slowly developed. Conferences are being called with technique as the theme, workers are already exchanging in a small way plans that have proved successful in their own experience. Your university secretary suggests a coordination of the methods, forms and programs of the whole field and the making of some arrangement for putting into the hands of our local workers this valuable fund of information.

*Lists of Churches in Denominational Year Books.* It is a great advantage to university pastors and their interested student helpers to have the names of newly arriving first year stu-



dents. It might be of some aid to them in obtaining this information if lists of churches in each community best adapted to serve as student centers were published in the several denominational year books in order that parents and home pastors might notify the ministers of such churches regarding incoming students.

Several denominations have loan funds for college students. It has occurred to your university secretary that he might have a list of the men to whom loans have been made and interview them when he is visiting the several institutions.

*Recruiting for Christian Life Work.* Probably one of the most valuable services a university secretary can render the Council and the general cause of the church is that of discovering students of outstanding ability and enlisting them in Christian life service. Many great commercial firms today have personnel men who do nothing but visit colleges and universities pressing the opportunities they have to offer upon the most brilliant students, basing their appeal on financial considerations. They obtain the names of such students through the office of the dean of the college or the dean of men, and in the case of a student being an exceptional man, his college course is assured either by a scholarship or a summer position.

The church has a legitimate claim to its share of these outstanding college graduates and must adopt to some extent the methods used by the commercial firms. The student pastor is the key to the situation, noting students active in social service in the college and giving their names to your university secretary just as the college deans supply the names of outstanding students to the personnel men of the great industrial firms. In many cases these students already will have demonstrated their fitness for and love of a work which might well be made their life calling. Idealism and adventure still imbue the hearts of hundreds of our choicest youth and they will gladly respond to the call for Christian life service, if its claims are properly presented. So many young men seem to wait for someone to step in and turn the balance. If Christian service is shown as a hard job with great opportunity to help mankind, the interest of the most desirable men will be challenged. The far-reaching effects of discovering a mere half dozen men of the Fosdick and Speer type cannot be measured.

## A NEW APOLOGETIC FOR THE DENOMINATIONAL COLLEGE

H. O. PRITCHARD

In the interest of clearness it is well at the outset of this paper to define the terms used and to indicate definitely the phases of the subject with which we are dealing. The two words in this title which need clarification are "apologetic" and "denominational." We shall use the word "apologetic" in its customary meaning, namely, a defense, a justification, a vindication. By "denominational" we do not mean sectarian. We do not mean an institution that is closed to new discoveries of truth, or new interpretations of old truth, or the acquisition of new knowledge. Rather do we use the word "denominational" with reference to the primary objectives of the college and the relationship which it sustains to the religious body which founded it, and which fosters or supports it. We use the phrase "denominational college" in the sense of church college—a college which is definitely linked to the church by the ties of heritage, services rendered and purposes maintained.

Having thus defined the terms, may we state the object of this inquiry? We shall not attempt to formulate a new apologetic for the denominational college, but rather do we wish to point out the need for and indicate something of the lines along which such an apologetic should and can be formulated. The changes which have taken place in higher education in recent years have been so numerous, so varied and so far reaching that we are brought face to face with the task of formulating a new apologetic which can be maintained in the presence of the new situation. The old arguments and reasons have lost much of their force. Many of them are no longer valid and most of them are unconvincing.

If the church is to continue to function in the field of higher education through and by means of church colleges, and if the constituency of the church is to be aroused to an adequate support of such institutions, then certainly new arguments, new reasons, new justifications must be advanced which are convince-

ing and which have underneath them and back of them facts and evidences which are beyond reasonable dispute.

This Council is comprised of Church Boards of Education. These various Church Boards of Education are the instruments through which the respective religious bodies function in the field of education. While these various Church Boards differ widely as to type of organization and ecclesiastical relationship, nevertheless, they are similar as to objectives and functions. And again, while our Boards differ as to scopes of work and types of service, we are all much alike in one purpose at least, namely, the fostering or promoting or maintaining of colleges. While we have great differences as to the exact relationships which colleges sustain to the supporting bodies, ranging all the way from absolute ownership and control of the college to a very loose ecclesiastical connection, nevertheless, whatever may be the character of the relationship, these colleges so related are regarded as an expression of the respective religious bodies in the field of higher education. Now precisely because we are Church Boards of Education and precisely because one of the instrumentalities by which we function for the church in the field of higher education is the denominational college, therefore, the subject of this paper should be one of vital concern to every Board represented in this Council and, indeed, to the Council itself. There is a recognition of this fact in the topic for discussion at this afternoon's session, namely, "The Place and Function of the Church Boards of Education and of the Council."

It would be presumptuous of me to undertake to point out to you the many changes which have taken place in higher education in recent years. However, with the purpose of defining the problem under discussion more clearly, I should like to point out a few significant trends with which we are all familiar and which trends bear directly on this matter of formulating a new apologetic for the denominational college.

First of all, there is the history in America of the relationship between the church and the school. Beginning with what was virtually a monopoly of all education, the church has gradually

abandoned one field after another; and while some of the churches represented in this Council still attempt to function in education, all the way from the kindergarten up through the university, nevertheless, it is a fact that most of the churches represented here today have gradually withdrawn from the fields which they once occupied. First they abandoned the primary school, then the secondary school and now they must seriously consider what they are to do in the field of higher education. Is the church to abandon this field also?

There is a second trend—the tendency of colleges which have been fostered and maintained by the church to gradually withdraw from the church and become non-denominational or independent. This tendency is very marked with institutions which happen to be in cities of size and which institutions gradually become municipal in fact if not in name. Then again colleges which attain age and which are successful in securing large resources tend to cut loose from the church and declare their independence, no matter where located. Of course, there are notable exceptions to this general statement; nevertheless, I think it can be successfully maintained that the foregoing is a strong tendency.

A third tendency is the secularization of education. Just in proportion as the church has abandoned these fields and other instrumentalities have become dominant in them, this process of secularization has grown apace. It is impossible to dwell at length upon the various phases of this secularization process or to render a specific bill of indictments. Perhaps one or two concrete illustrations will suffice to make clear what is meant. A prominent Catholic, a man of wealth, a banker, a trustee of a state university, said to me not long ago that the secularization of education in America would eventually destroy the religion of those who accept it. Another man of educational prominence, who has been connected with university life for more than a quarter of a century and who knows intimately the inner life of a number of large institutions of higher learning, recently said to me. "If I were to tell what I know regarding the breakdown of character and of vital faith which is taking place in

certain educational institutions, it would become the most sensational news story of the day. But immediately the presidents, faculties, student bodies and alumni would come forward with vociferous denials and within a week I would be proved the most consummate liar since Ananias; whereas every statement that I had made would be absolutely true." This gentleman is neither a cynic nor a pessimist. He has an optimistic attitude toward life and has a profound faith in young people; but he has the wisdom to discern the deadly results on the side of character that are taking place because of this secularization of education.

There is a fourth tendency which is directly opposite to the one just mentioned and which constitutes our ground for optimism and faith in the future. There is also increasing recognition of the importance and place of religion in higher education. Some of the large universities in recent years have created new offices which function in the field of religious oversight and care, and have called outstanding men to fill these offices. State and national educational gatherings are placing a renewed emphasis upon character education. Schools of religion are being established in connection with state universities. The joint session of this Council and the Association of American Colleges tomorrow afternoon will be devoted exclusively to the theme, "The Place of Religion in American Higher Education." Similar sessions have been held during recent years. We are encouraged to believe that there is a recognition of the need of religion in education and that a larger place is to be given to it in the immediate future.

In the light of these and other tendencies which could be mentioned, what apologetic can be made for the denominational college? At this point may I call attention to a distinction which, it appears to me, must be kept in mind as we come to grips with this subject. I refer to the distinction between the term "Christian college" and the term "church college." I do so for the reason that most institutions of learning claim to be Christian and the use of that term does not necessarily involve or even imply any church relationship. Furthermore, many institutions resent the implication which is involved in the narrowing of the

term "Christian college" to include simply those institutions fostered and supported by the church. Besides, the thing which we have in mind is an apologetic for the college which is definitely and positively identified with the church. And again, it is not simply an organic relationship we have in mind so much as it is a vital relationship.

As we undertake to form such an apologetic there are certain questions which immediately press for answer. For example:

1. Do those institutions which sever church relationship and become independent remain as essentially and predominantly Christian as they formerly were?

2. Do such institutions continue to render to the church as large a service as they formerly did?

3. Is there any essential difference between so-called Christian colleges and the colleges which are definitely and unequivocally linked up with the church?

4. Is it possible to have academic freedom and sound education in a church college? Or, to state the question in the language of the theme of this annual meeting. Can the church college lead students to think and at the same time teach them what to think?

5. What contribution to the church is the church college making which is not being made by independent or tax-supported institutions? Or, to broaden the question somewhat and to state it a little more constructively. What is to be the place and program of the church in higher education in the future?

6. Can the church in the light of present educational and economic conditions maintain church colleges at the point of educational efficiency? Or, have educational standards and requirements outrun economic ability?

There are many other questions which, no doubt, occur to you at once, but perhaps these are sufficient to indicate the particular field which we wish to cover in this new apologetic of which we speak. It is needless to say that no such apologetic can be formulated by *a priori* reasoning, deductive logic, or *ex cathedra* statements. The apologetic must rest upon ascertained facts through scientific studies and surveys. Many investigations and studies have already been made which provide material for the formulation of such an apologetic. For example, some of the studies which Dr. Kelly has made, particularly his survey of the



Episcopal colleges. The studies which some of our Boards of Education have made also give us laboratory findings from which to reach justifiable conclusions. Such articles as the one entitled, "The Social and Religious Influences of the Small Denominational College" by Raymond B. Stevens, of Elmira College, which appeared in the December issue of the Association of American Colleges *Bulletin*, furnish us the kind of material and the type of argument which we must employ in this new apologetic. Personally, I should like to see this Council or some committee of the Council set itself definitely to this task for the coming year. If we cannot make our case, let us be frank enough and honest enough to say so. If we can make it, then let us be courageous enough to present it to the world without apology or equivocation.

In conclusion may I cite a personal experience which, to my mind, not only proves the need for such an apologetic, but likewise indicates something of its character:

Not long ago I asked a prominent, liberal, consecrated and well-to-do layman of my own religious body to make a very large gift to one of our colleges in which he is especially interested. The amount for which I asked is represented by more than six numerals. After some hesitation this was his reply: (I do not quote his words exactly, but I quote him correctly as to substance.)

I suppose I could make such a gift, although I could not do it without sacrifice. It will mean a very great struggle on my part to pay such an amount. However, I am willing to undertake it if only I can have assurances that this college is to remain the servant of the church. I do not ask for any creedal statements or any theological assurances. I am willing to give large latitude at that point and I certainly want academic freedom. I even desire the institution to be in position should Christian union come to become a part of such a union, but I wish it still to continue to be the servant of the church. Let me illustrate what I have in mind. There is in the city in which I live an institution of learning that was founded by a certain religious body. I have lived long enough in that city to know something of the struggles of that institution. I know some of the men and women who made heroic sacrifices in order that the institu-

tion might live. They were consecrated members of the church and gave because they believed in the church. That institution has grown rapidly in buildings, in resources and in student body in recent years, but just in proportion as it has grown it has drawn away from the church and its original purpose. I have served as a regent of the state university in my own Commonwealth. I know both these institutions well and I wish to say to you that from my viewpoint the state university is more Christian and is actually doing as much or more for the advancement of the Kingdom of God than is that college under present management, which was founded by and for the church. Now if this institution of ours is to go that same road, I am not going to give my money to it. If we are simply to maintain another liberal arts college and add one more unit to higher education, then I am not going to make this sacrifice. It is not worth it. I will pay my taxes to support the state institution and give my money to worthier causes.

What answer have we to make to this good man and to hundreds of men and women who are thinking in like manner?

---

A STUDY made during the year of the influences leading to a decision among young people for life service on the mission field brought out the significant fact that of 100 young people in colleges and graduate schools, who expect to become foreign missionaries after completing their preparation, only one made a decision for this work due to influences during college life. The decisions of the others all dated back to influences in the home, to parents who had wished to go to the field, ministers in home churches, Sunday-school teachers, missionaries at home on furlough, and other forces of pre-college life.

THE RELIGIOUS EDUCATION ASSOCIATION will hold its twenty-seventh Annual Convention at the Municipal Auditorium, Cleveland, Ohio, April 23-25, 1930. The theme: "Our Changing Mores and their Significance for Character and Religious Education."

MR. LYNN HAROLD HOUGH has been elected Professor of Homiletics at Drew Theological Seminary.

## REPORT OF THE FINDINGS COMMITTEE\*

WILLIAM CHALMERS COVERT

The Committee has just taken the matter of a budget for 1930 into consideration and reviewed the figures, and makes the recommendation that it remain just about where it was. With the recommendation of the Findings Committee on the matter of budget, Mr. Chairman, we submit our report as follows:

The Council of Church Boards of Education in its nineteenth annual session recognizes with great appreciation the deepening sense of mutuality and profitable fellowship that the years are bringing to its constituent members. It is grateful for the spirit and high character of the papers and discussions of the present sessions. The orderly procedure that was made possible through the effective work of Dr. Kelly and the executive officers, has added much to the enjoyment and general satisfaction of the program. Unless there be a more vital integration of general church educational work and leadership and a constant stimulus of the morale of those who are fighting for Christian ideals and objectives in education against heavy odds, we are convinced that the standing of organized Christianity is to be put in jeopardy within the next generation. With a growing sense of the serious significance of the every phase of Christian education in the life of our modern world we adopt the following statements:

*I. The Field of the Council*

In order to a more effective impact on the part of the Council upon the major problems of education as they involve the church, it is our conviction that until otherwise directed the Council should give its chief attention to the church program of higher

\*The following statement, not a part of the formal report, was presented in substance by the Chairman, approved and referred to the Executive Committee, by whom it was formally adopted, February 8, 1930:

**VOTED:** That the Council express to the standardizing agencies its hearty approval of the movement upon which they are now entering of measuring schools and colleges by the most vital and thoroughly qualitative standards.

The Council believes this movement will greatly increase the effectiveness of the educational institutions of the country.

education as represented in the schools and colleges affiliated with the churches and in the student groups at our tax supported institutions.

This takes for granted a careful correlation of our activities with all other interdenominational educational organizations in order that the total program of Christian education shall be cooperatively met.

## II. *Secondary Education*

With the growing precocity of our youth and the earlier periods of their fixations and life decisions, secondary education is taking on new meaning. The subject greatly concerns all educational leaders who seek to meet our children with all possible culture methods and material and character making influences at the formative crises of their lives. The church is not meeting the problem of secondary education. We recommend that the executive officers of the Council be asked to make a study of the present status of secondary education and the possible relationship of the church boards to this branch of education.

## III. *A New Apologetic for the Church College*

We believe the church college in our present educational order entirely essential. So vitally related through its unique opportunity to the maintenance of the Christian ideals of our American culture and to the producing of a dependable type of leadership in our American democracy, that now to minimize the place and influence of the Christian college or to withdraw its distinctive contribution from our social order would leave our educational system with a problem it has no way of solving.

The spiritual values of education and its moral implications can be adequately developed only in the freedom and favoring atmosphere of the Christian college. The imperilled concepts of present day Christian culture, the diluted loyalty to spiritual realities of a growing group of educators, the tragic need of the entire Christian church for an intellectually gifted and spiritually fit leadership in the coming generation make the existence and generous support of the worthy Christian college an educational and religious obligation which the Christian community cannot evade without serious consequences.

#### IV. *Preparation for Professional Religious Education*

We believe a growing consideration must be given by our colleges to the subject of the preparation of professional religious educational leaders. The presence of an oversupply of ill equipped educational workers embarrasses the church. The problems of modern religious education are too intricate and baffling to yield to any other than thoroughly educated men and women. The educationally minded layman has a right to ask provision for his academic equipment for a layman's work. It seems in order to urge this situation upon the Boards of the Council and to ask for further light upon the situation through the executive officers of the Council.

#### V. *Study of the Functions of the Boards of Education and of the Council*

In view of the shifting functions of church boards and the enlarging of their scope of work and in view of the collateral developments in the general field of the educational responsibility of the Council, it is recommended that a commission of five be appointed to study and report upon:

1. Changed situations in the educational field of church colleges
2. Present status of constituent church boards of education under provisions of their governing bodies
3. Present modus operandi of Council as it concerns existing interdenominational educational bodies
4. As to the technique and general procedure in meeting present day needs for religious culture in faculties and student bodies
5. As to the present development of schools of religion and other types of cooperative religious work on the campus of state schools as the movement affects the cultivation of piety, spirituality, and the motives for extending the kingdom of God on earth.

# REPORT OF THE TREASURER OF THE COUNCIL OF CHURCH BOARDS OF EDUCATION, 1929

Balance in bank, January 1, 1929 ..... \$ 237.46

## Receipts

### Constituent Boards of Education:

Northern Baptist Convention (including payment of \$208.33 on 1928 pledge).....	\$ 2,708.33	
Church of the Brethren .....	100.00	
Congregational Education Society .....	1,500.00	
Christian Church .....	300.00	
Disciples of Christ (including payment of \$500 on 1928 pledge) .....	1,500.00	
Evangelical Church .....	150.00	
Five Year Meeting, Society of Friends.....	200.00	
Mennonite Church of North America .....	25.00	
Methodist Episcopal Church (including payment of \$291.66 on 1928 pledge).....	4,041.64	
Methodist Episcopal Church, South .....	799.99	
Methodist Protestant Church .....	100.00	
Presbyterian Church, U. S. ....	600.00	
Presbyterian Church, U. S. A. ....	3,000.00	
Protestant Episcopal Church .....	2,000.00	
Reformed Church in America .....	360.00	
Reformed Church in the U. S. (including payment of \$100 on 1930 pledge) .....	200.00	
Seventh Day Baptist Education Society .....	50.00	
United Brethren in Christ .....	300.00	
United Lutheran Church in America .....	500.00	
United Presbyterian Church .....	500.00	
		\$18,934.96
Special Donations .....	387.50	
Association of American Colleges .....	14,180.40	
CHRISTIAN EDUCATION .....	2,571.00	
CHRISTIAN EDUCATION, Profit Account .....	.91	
COLLEGE ARCHITECTURE IN AMERICA .....	559.14	
Miscellaneous .....	110.72	\$36,744.63
<b>Total</b> .....		<b>\$36,982.09</b>

## Disbursements

Salaries .....	\$19,739.58	
Less various refunds .....	206.15	\$19,533.43
Office rent .....		2,199.96
Office expenses .....	1,904.51	
Less various refunds .....	186.91	1,717.60



MARCH, 1930

CHRISTIAN EDUCATION

Total Receipts for'd .....		\$36,982.09
Disbursements for'd .....	\$23,540.99	
Traveling expenses .....	546.24	
Less refund for Protestant Episcopal Church survey .....	120.00	426.24
CHRISTIAN EDUCATION .....		3,533.19
CHRISTIAN EDUCATION, offprint account .....		18.90
Annual Meeting .....		125.42
American Council on Education .....		100.00
College Architecture in America .....		501.51
OFFICE EQUIPMENT .....		1,190.15
To set up revolving fund for Mr. R. H. Leach .....		200.00
Miscellaneous, including bank service, insurance, etc.....		501.82 30,048.22
Balance in bank December 31, 1929 .....		\$ 6,933.87

General Statement of Financial Condition as of January 1, 1930

Assets

Cash in Bank, January 1, 1930 .....	\$6,933.87	
Cash in Special Funds:		
Petty cash at Council Office .....	21.97	
Held in Dr. R. L. Kelly's revolving fund .....	100.00	
Held in Mr. R. H. Leach's revolving fund .....	200.00	
Office furniture and fixtures .....	2,222.46	\$9,478.30

Liabilities

None

Capital Investments

Cash in Bank, January 1, 1929 .....	\$ 237.46	
Furniture and Fixtures, January 1, 1929.....	1,032.31	
Invested in Furniture and Fixtures during year .....	1,190.15	\$2,459.92
Net income for year 1929		
Income .....	36,744.63	
Expenses .....	\$30,048.22	
Less unexpended petty cash and revolving funds.....	321.97 29,726.25	7,018.38 \$9,478.30

We hereby certify that the annexed statement of receipts and disbursements for the fiscal year ended December 31, 1929, is correct and true; and that the statement of financial conditions is, in our opinion, a true statement of the financial condition of the Council of Church Boards of Education as of January 1, 1930.

BANK OF NEW YORK AND TRUST COMPANY,

By: CHARLES ELDEEDGE,

Vice-President.

**MINUTES OF THE NINETEENTH ANNUAL MEETING OF THE COUNCIL OF CHURCH BOARDS OF EDUCATION, WASHINGTON, D. C.**

**THE WILLARD, JANUARY 13, 14, 1930**

*Theme:* Shall Christian education attempt to lead students to think and to teach them what to think?

**MONDAY, JANUARY 13, 1930**

*Morning Session*

The Nineteenth Annual Meeting of the Council of Church Boards of Education was called to order in the Hotel Willard, Washington, D. C., at 10:00 A. M., Monday, January 13, 1930, by the President, Dr. Boothe C. Davis.

The devotional period was conducted by Dr. William Orville Mendenhall, President of Friends University and Presiding Clerk of the Five Years' Meeting of Friends.

The program as published in the December, 1929, issue of CHRISTIAN EDUCATION was generally followed.

President Boothe C. Davis gave the opening address on the subject: "Modern College Training and Denominational Loyalties." Referred to the Findings Committee.

The thirteenth annual report of the Executive Secretary was read by Dr. Robert L. Kelly. It was

**VOTED:** To accept the report, with appreciation, and to refer it to the Findings Committee.

Dr. Alfred W. Anthony made a report regarding his continued efforts in the field of finance. The appreciation of the Council was expressed to Dr. Anthony and the report referred to the Findings Committee.

Brief reports were made by the Chairmen of the Standing Committees:

Dr. H. O. Pritchard.....	Colleges
Dr. W. S. Bovard.....	Religious Education
Dr. George R. Baker.....	Universities
Mr. E. L. Shaver.....	Life Work

Dr. Milton C. Towner, Professor of Religious Education, University of Missouri and President of the Triennial Conference of

Church Workers in Universities and Colleges, made a report on the present status of religion at universities.

The President announced the following committees:

*Nominating Committee:* Dr. F. E. Stockwell, Dr. G. F. Baker, Dr. D. W. Brown, President W. A. Harper, President E. E. Rall.

*Findings Committee:* Doctors W. C. Covert, F. W. Padelford, M. W. Lampe, N. J. Gould Wickey, W. S. Bovard, Rev. C. L. Glenn.

The Council adjourned at 12:30 P. M.

#### *Afternoon Session*

The Council was called to order at 2:30 P. M. by the President.

Dr. William Orville Mendenhall led the devotions.

The topic of the period was "The Place and Function of the Church Boards of Education and of the Council." General discussion was opened by Dr. William Chalmers Covert. Others taking part were: Dr. Bovard, Dr. Bradford, Dr. Anthony, Dr. Pritchard, President S. O. Bond, President W. A. Harper, President H. M. Gage, Dr. Todd. The discussion was summarized by Dr. Frank W. Padelford.

VOTED: To refer the matter to the Committee on Findings.

The Council adjourned at 4:30 P. M.

#### *Evening Session*

The meeting was called to order by the President at 7:30 P. M.

The business session was postponed until the following morning.

Devotional period was led by Dr. Mendenhall.

The Executive Secretary, presented to the Council three new members:

Dr. N. J. Gould Wickey, Executive Secretary, Board of Education, United Lutheran Church in America.

Dr. W. R. Kedzie, Congregational Education Society.

Dr. O. T. Deever, successor to Dr. W. E. Shell as Secretary, Board of Education, Church of the United Brethren in Christ.

Dr. Kelly also introduced Dr. Rufus M. Weaver, who spoke briefly regarding the manner in which the Government is taking up the fight against illiteracy.

The topic of the evening was "How may the institutions and agencies of the churches meet the two-fold task set forth in the general theme of this meeting?" Dr. N. J. Gould Wickey read a paper on the subject. General discussion followed, Dr. Binford, Dr. Blackwell, Dr. Kirk and others participating. The summary was given by Dr. William S. Bovard.

The Council adjourned at 9:15 P. M.

TUESDAY, JANUARY 14, 1930

*Morning Session*

The meeting was called to order by President Boothe C. Davis at 10:15 A. M.

Dr. Mendenhall took charge of the devotions.

The Executive Secretary presented the Treasurer's report for the year 1929. It was stated that the Bank of New York and Trust Company had certified the report, making a special Auditing Committee unnecessary.

VOTED: To adopt the Treasurer's report.

Dr. Kelly announced that the Council members were invited to visit the Washington Cathedral at 4:30 P. M.

The theme for the morning was announced by President Davis as "May a student movement be created which will lead students to think and guide them in their thinking?"

The discussion was led by Rev. Gardiner M. Day, Assistant Rector, St. John's Protestant Episcopal Church, Williamstown, Mass., and Mr. Martyn D. Keeler, Student in Union Theological Seminary. Others taking part in the discussion were Dr. J. M. Culbreth, Dr. W. S. Bovard, Mr. C. P. Shedd, Dr. E. E. Rall, Mr. David R. Porter and Miss Gladys Taylor. Dr. M. Willard Lampe summarized the discussion.

Dr. William Chalmers Covert read the report of the Committee on Findings.

VOTED: That the budget for 1930 be adopted with power for any necessary alterations delegated to the incoming Executive Committee.

It was

VOTED: To adopt the report of the Committee, including Dr. Covert's recommendation for the appointment of a special committee for a new study of the status of the Council.

It was

VOTED: That the Council refer the resolution relative to standards of the accrediting agencies to the Executive Committee.

Dr. F. E. Stockwell presented the report of the Nominating Committee. It was noted that since the work of the Committee on Normal Colleges has really been a part of the work of the University Committee, the two committees are now combined in order to save extra committees.

It was

VOTED: That the officers nominated be elected, as follows:

*Officers for 1930*

*President*—Dr. E. E. Rall

*Vice-President*—Miss Mary E. Markley

*Recording Secretary*—Mr. Harry T. Stock

*Treasurer*—Bank of New York and Trust Company

*Additional Members of the Executive Committee*

Drs. F. E. Stockwell, B. C. Davis, Frank W. Padelford, W. S. Bovard and R. L. Kelly, *Ex-officio*.

*Standing Committees*

*American Council on Education*: R. L. Kelly (three years), John L. Seaton (two years), C. C. McCracken (one year).

*Colleges*: H. O. Pritchard, H. H. Sherman, S. K. Mosiman, R. E. Tulloss, J. P. MacMillan, W. R. Kedzie, N. J. Gould Wickey.

*University Committee*: Geo. R. Baker, W. L. Young, Frances P. Greenough, Katherine C. Foster, Mary E. Markley, W. F. Sheldon, H. T. Stock, C. P. Harry, J. M. Culbreth, C. Leslie Glenn, Joseph C. Todd, J. E. Bradford, Jean Dayton, M. C. Towner.

*Religious Education*: W. A. Harper, W. D. Brown, A. E. Kirk, W. O. Mendenhall, O. T. Deever, F. W. Stephenson, H. H. Sweets.

*American Association on Religion:* H. T. Stock, J. W. Suter, Jr., R. H. Leach.

*Life Work:* E. L. Shaver, Gilbert Lovell, C. S. Bauslin, H. H. Sweets.

The meeting was dismissed by Dr. Todd at 12:10 P. M.

*Afternoon Session*

Union Mass Meeting

President Davis called the meeting to order at 2:50 P. M.

The names of the committee to restudy the functions of the Council of Church Boards of Education were announced by the President: Dr. W. C. Covert, Chairman, Dr. H. H. Sweets, Dr. F. W. Padelford, Dr. H. O. Pritchard, Dr. A. E. Kirk.

Mr. David R. Porter led in prayer.

The speakers on the topic—"The Place of Religion in American Higher Education"—were: President Avery A. Shaw, Denison University; Rev. Samuel M. Shoemaker, Jr., Rector of Calvary Protestant Episcopal Church, New York City; Bishop William F. McDowell of the Methodist Episcopal Church, Washington, D. C.

The Council adjourned *sine die* at 4:30 P. M.

(Signed) RAYMOND H. LEACH,  
*Secretary pro tem.*



## MEETING OF THE PRESBYTERIAN COLLEGE UNION

PRESIDENT HARRY M. GAGE, Coe College

The Presbyterian College Union held its twenty-ninth annual meeting in Washington on January 16. The Union has forty-five member institutions of which thirty were represented at the meeting. Five new presidents were present: John Bailey Kelly, College of Emporia; Albert G. Parker, Hanover; Wendell S. Brooks, Intermountain Union; Thomas W. Bibb, Albany; Ward W. Sullivan, Whitworth.

There was some expression of feeling that it was difficult to sustain interest in a meeting of the Union immediately following sessions of the Association of American Colleges.

Dr. C. C. McCracken, Professor of Educational Administration at Ohio State University, a member of the staff of the Presbyterian Board of Christian Education for two years, made a report. His survey of Presbyterian colleges will be completed soon. It will reveal especially the academic status of institutions and the particular service of colleges in promoting the program of the church for Christian education in higher institutions.

Frank D. McElroy, of Western Reserve University, is making a study of the education and training of college teachers. He presented his plan to the Union, which is cooperating with him in making the study.

Dr. F. E. Stockwell, General Director of the Department of Colleges of the Presbyterian Board of Christian Education, reported on the present situation in our colleges. One half of the reporting colleges have no financial campaigns on hand or in mind. Three plan campaigns in terms of millions. A campaign apparently involves two or three years of preparation and solicitation followed by a five-year collection period. Eleven new buildings are reported. Attendance is stationary, five colleges reporting increases and four losses, junior colleges reduce attendance in Iowa and Texas, the former state having twenty-nine and the latter seventy-two junior colleges. Promotional programs are not always definite. Those for buildings and endowment are more definite and numerous than those for academic

program. Community service is the most variable feature of college activity. In 1928 twelve colleges failed to meet the endowment requirements of various regional standardizing agencies. These colleges had debts amounting to \$1,000,000 and need \$3,800,000 to meet requirements. The debts of other institutions amount to \$700,000.

The Union made plans whereby a delegation from the Union will confer in the near future with the Board of Christian Education on problems of mutual interest and especially on the matter of working through the General Council to present to the General Assembly in May, 1930, a plan to secure an adequate capital sum for our colleges.

The President's Address, given by President W. A. Garfield, of Carroll, raised the problem of our responsibility for students in the lowest third of their high school classes who are refused admission to many colleges. Such students are admitted to state universities and do not constitute the major portion of those dropped for poor scholarship.

W. W. Boyd, President of Western College for Women, defined the purpose of our liberal arts colleges as being the production of free minds (unprejudiced), generous minds, minds with convictions, minds rejoicing in activity and minds obedient to the Divine wisdom.

## THE SIXTEENTH ANNUAL MEETING OF THE ASSOCIATION OF AMERICAN COLLEGES

ARCHIE M. PALMER

Following immediately upon the close of the nineteenth annual meeting of the Council of Church Boards of Education, the sixteenth annual meeting of the Association of American Colleges opened Tuesday evening, January 14, 1930, with a banquet at The Willard, Washington, D. C. Over three hundred persons were present at the dinner.

President Guy E. Snavelly, of Birmingham-Southern College, the president of the Association, presided at the meeting and in his presidential address discussed "World Peace and the Colleges." The main address of the evening was delivered by Dr. Charles Moore, Chairman of the National Commission of Fine Arts, who spoke on "The Place of the Fine Arts in Education." The retiring British Ambassador to the United States and Lady Isabella Howard were the guests of honor. In response to a resolution of appreciation of his services to education and to international understanding, the Ambassador spoke briefly.

In his annual report delivered at the Wednesday morning session, the Executive Secretary, Dr. Robert L. Kelly, discussed the activities of the Association during the past year and outlined a program for the new year. President Frank L. McVey, of the University of Kentucky, presented the report of the Commission on Educational Surveys and Professor George Johnson of the Catholic University of America spoke on "The Recent Development of the Catholic College."

At the afternoon session President James A. Blaisdell, of Claremont Colleges, and Dean Luther P. Eisenhower, of Princeton University, spoke on "The Intellectual Life in the Colleges," and President C. C. Mierow, of Colorado College, gave an illustrated talk on "College Chapel Buildings in America."

The evening session was devoted to the theme, "The Improvement of College Teaching." President Albert H. Upham, of Miami University, discussed the educating of college teachers from the point of view of the liberal arts college, and Dean Wilbur L. Cross, of the Graduate School of Yale University, continued the discussion from the point of view of the graduate

school. Dr. Henry Suzzallo, of the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching; the United States Commissioner of Education, Dr. William J. Cooper; Dr. Charles H. Judd, of the University of Chicago, and Dr. Charles R. Mann, Director of the American Council on Education, participated in the discussion from the floor.

At the business session Thursday morning, Professor Bert E. Young, of Indiana University, presented the report of the Commission on College Athletics, which contained an endorsement of the recent Carnegie report on college athletics. The Treasurer's report was presented by Warden Bernard I. Bell, of St. Stephen's College, Columbia University, and on his retirement the Association passed a resolution of appreciation for his unselfish and efficient services as Treasurer of the Association for the past five years.

In behalf of the Committee on Nominations, Dean Archibald L. Bouton, of New York University, submitted nominations of the officers and members of standing commissions. The following officers were thereupon elected:

President, Dean Luther P. Eisenhart, of Princeton University.

Vice President, Dean Herbert E. Hawkes, of Columbia College.

Treasurer, President William M. Lewis, of Lafayette College.  
Chancellor Samuel P. Capen, of the University of Buffalo, and President James L. McConaughy, of Wesleyan University, were elected to serve with the permanent Executive Secretary as additional members of the Executive Committee.

Professor Joseph Mayer, fraternal delegate of the American Association of University Professors, submitted a statement about the placement service of that association. Dean Gordon J. Laing, of the Graduate School of Arts and Literature of the University of Chicago, presented an admirable paper on "The Doctor of Philosophy and College Teaching." Following the presentation by President John L. Seaton, of Albion College, of the report of the Committee on Resolutions, the meeting adjourned.

Wednesday noon the delegates were received by President Hoover and photographed with him on the steps of the State, War and Navy Building. They were also entertained at tea that afternoon by the American Association of University Women at their national club house.

## ANNUAL MEETING OF THE NORTH CENTRAL SECTION OF THE NATIONAL CONFERENCE OF CHURCH WORKERS IN UNIVERSITIES

RAYMOND H. LEACH

More than one hundred delegates from seventeen different states of the North Central Region attended the Conference of Church Workers in Universities at the University of Illinois, December 30, 31, 1929, and January 1, 1930.

The general theme of the meeting was "The Experience and Technique of Church Work in Colleges and Universities." The papers were exceptionally good and those dealing with the most significant topics will appear in early issues of *CHRISTIAN EDUCATION* in order that they may be available for all campus religious workers.

The program was planned by President Dean R. Leland, assisted by the staff of church workers at the University of Illinois, who proved themselves to be most gracious hosts.

The meetings were held in the beautiful new building of the McKinley Foundation and were opened each day by impressive devotional services led by Rev. Melville T. Kennedy, pastor of the First Congregational Church of Champaign.

The discussions of the first day centered upon the topic, "What is the Job of the University Pastor?" Miss Genevieve Chase, University of Iowa, Rev. H. D. Bollinger, Purdue University, and Dr. Warren F. Sheldon, National Secretary of the Wesley Foundation Joint Committee, presented papers on the theme. The discussions emphasized the importance of using the church in the university center as a laboratory, teaching the social creed—the gospel of Jesus.

The denominational groups gathered in the various denominational buildings for luncheon. These meetings proved to be among the most profitable of the whole conference to many of the delegates because of the opportunity given to take up particular matters in a more detailed way than would have been possible in a general session.

The banquet at the Wesley Foundation was one of the high-spots of the conference. Dr. James E. Clarke, Editor of the

*Presbyterian Advance*, was guest of honor. Early in the year Dr. Clarke had offered a prize for the best student essay on the topic, "Youth's Discontent with the Church." Philip Tuttle, of the University of Illinois, who wrote the prize essay, and Miss Margaretha Rasmussen, University of Illinois, whose essay received honorable mention, were present and spoke. Dr. Clarke's address was based on the ideas gathered from a reading of all the essays. He said that the church had been and still is the dynamic force which impels men to high ideals and which gives to the world the "fruit of the spirit—love, joy, peace, long-suffering, kindness, goodness, faithfulness, meekness and self-control."

The theme of the second morning session was "What is the Religious Message to Students?" Dr. William P. Lemon, University of Minnesota, Rev. N. A. McCune, Michigan Agricultural College, and Dr. Joseph C. Todd, Indiana School of Religion, opened the discussion. It was pointed out that abiding things and spiritual values should above all else be stressed.

"The Use of the Religious Drama" was the topic of a paper presented by Rev. William C. Fawell, Wesley Foundation, University of Nebraska. "Drama," said Mr. Fawell, "is one of the best means of presenting truth and developing religious life in young people."

At the general session following the conference dinner, Professor Mack Evans, organist and choirmaster of the University of Chicago, Father John A. O'Brien, of the Newman Foundation, University of Illinois, and Mr. Harry T. Stock, of the Congregational Education Society, each spoke on the theme, "The Ministry of Worship." The uses which can be made of sermon, story, inspirational literature, music, pictures, ceremonies and ritual, drama, prayer and meditation were brought out.

Wednesday afternoon, January 1, 1930, brought to a close probably the most inspiring and worth while conference which the church workers in universities of the North Central Region have held in many years.

Papers from the Conference will be published in future issues of CHRISTIAN EDUCATION.



## DEPARTMENT OF BIBLICAL INSTRUCTION

OFFICIAL ORGAN OF THE NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF BIBLICAL  
INSTRUCTORS, EDITED BY ISMAR J. PERITZ, PROFESSOR OF  
BIBLICAL LITERATURE, SYRACUSE UNIVERSITY

*Editorial*

## A FORWARD STEP

In compliance with the action taken at the annual meeting of the Eastern Branch of the National Association of Biblical Instructors relating to obtaining more space for its use, the Editorial Secretary takes pleasure in announcing that through the courtesy of Dr. Robert L. Kelly and the Executive Committee of the Council of Church Boards of Education eight additional pages have been added for our disposal in CHRISTIAN EDUCATION. Under present financial conditions this is as far as we could safely go. The action of the Executive Committee was as follows:

VOTED, That CHRISTIAN EDUCATION be increased by sixteen pages, of which eight shall be given to the National Association of Biblical Instructors, the hope being earnestly expressed that this organization may be able to contribute to the extra cost either by an increased number of subscriptions or by a subsidy.

The Association is pledged to contribute to the extra cost of the additional space. By far the most satisfactory way to make this contribution would be by means of an increase of the membership of our Association which carries with it a subscription to CHRISTIAN EDUCATION. According to the report of our treasurer, published in the February number of CHRISTIAN EDUCATION, we have had 338 members to whom CHRISTIAN EDUCATION went for a part of their membership fee of two dollars. It requires an additional membership of 180 to meet the financial obligation for the increased space of eight pages, and in the same proportion we can measure our anticipated growth in publication. Four issues of CHRISTIAN EDUCATION during the year under our control, giving us a quarterly magazine such as was

proposed by Professor Cadbury at the annual meeting, would require an addition of at least 550 members. If we could raise or membership from 338 to 1,000 our quarterly journal would be assured.

What shall we do about it? One thing is certain: we must at once start to increase our membership to pay for the additional eight pages; and while we are at it, let us set the higher goal. It is quite evident that our present membership is disproportionately too small in comparison with the number of instructors in Bible and religion in the 449 institutions where, according to reliable statistics, these subjects are taught. Not only should others of our colleagues be induced to join our ranks, but our communities contain those interested in Christian education to whom an appeal also to join our ranks would be in place.

If each present member of our Association would consider himself or herself a committee of one to secure two additional members, our quarterly magazine would become a fact. Will you do it?

But there is another phase to our growth. With better facilities for publication we shall need also more material for publication. The demand for more space was brought about by the increased incoming of material. But we must constantly stimulate to literary effort in our field. The content, method, and aim of the study of the Bible and religion on the part of those who teach in secondary schools, colleges, and theological seminaries, and in other institutions, constitute our special field of investigation. We invite fresh contributions and cooperation that will aid us in dealing with the problems we have to face.—*I. J. P.*

## SOME ROMAN CATHOLIC WRITERS ON JESUS\*

PROFESSOR RALPH K. HICKOK, Wells College

This paper is not a contribution to human knowledge. It is recognized, I think, that that is not the first purpose of our Association. Our sister society, the Society of Biblical Literature and Exegesis, to which many of us belong, has that for its particular province. Our aim is, for the most part, more practical. But if this paper is not a contribution to general human knowledge it is, nevertheless, a report of a contribution to my own insight and knowledge, and as such is herewith presented.

There were several reasons in my mind for entering upon this project. First, I had become interested in two studies made under the auspices of *THE INQUIRY*: the one, "The Fairfield Experiment, The Story of One Episode in an Effort Towards a Better Understanding of Catholics by Protestants;" the other, "How Catholics See Protestants." This second was frankly based upon the first and was an attempt to face the same situation, only in the reverse direction. These two studies are probably familiar to a good many of you and I have no desire to speak of them further. They awakened my interest and led me, at least, to wish to see a little further into the Roman Catholic mind.

A second influence came from the report of the recent Harvard conference of Jews, Catholics and Protestants. This conference, sponsored by the Calvert Round Table, a Roman Catholic organization, had for its purpose the fostering of the spirit of goodwill and tolerance between the three participating groups.

A third, and I think the dominating, motive may be traced back to our good friend, Professor Peritz. He invited me, a few weeks ago, to speak to a group of his students at Syracuse who are organized into a club known as "The Biblical Club." I chose for my topic "Recent Attitudes toward Jesus on the Part Of Jewish Scholars." Having done that I felt a desire to do something of the same sort with Roman Catholic writers. This paper is the result.

\* Address of the President of the National Association of Biblical Instructors at the Twentieth Annual Meeting, New York City, December, 31, 1929.

The books selected for reading were of two sorts; first, a group dealing with the whole of Jesus' life or with phases of it; and second a group dealing with Roman Catholic thought in a more general way. My real concern was with the first group; the ones in the second group were read merely in the hope that they might help me to interpret the former more correctly and more sympathetically. The first group contained the following:

- Fillion, L. C. *The Life of Christ*, translated from the French by Newton Thompson; B. Herder Book Co., 1928.  
Marnas, Melanie. *Who Is Then This Man?* translated from the French by Henry Longan Stuart; Dutton, 1929.  
Conway, Bertrand L. *The Virgin Birth*, Paulist Press, 1924.  
Scott, Martin J. *The Virgin Birth*, P. J. Kennedy and Sons, 1925.  
Seché, Alphonse. *The Radiant Story of Jesus*, translated from the French by Helen Davenport Gibbons; Century Company, 1927.

The second group contained the following:

- Moehlman, Conrad H. *The Catholic-Protestant Mind*, Harpers, 1929.  
Martindale, C. C. *The Faith of the Roman Church*, Doubleday, Doran and Co., 1928.  
Barrett, Boyd. *While Peter Sleeps*, Ives Washburn, 1929.  
Garrison, Winfred Ernest. *Catholicism and the American Mind*, Willett, Clark and Colby, 1928.  
Pope, Hugh. *The Catholic Church and the Bible*, Macmillan, 1928.

and the two little booklets published by THE INQUIRY, already referred to.

In the limited time at my disposal I wish, first, to make some very brief characterizations of the books in the first group, and then to make some observations upon the group as a whole.

The most important book which I have read is that by Fillion. In bulk alone it is impressive. It is projected upon a most ambitious scale. When completed there will be three large volumes, each of about seven hundred pages. Of these I have had access only to the first and second; the third is, I think, not yet from the press. The author is a teacher in a Catholic seminary in

France and Consultor of the Pontifical Biblical Commission, and has a goodly number of volumes to his credit. The subtitle to the present work is, "A Historical, Critical and Apologetic Exposition." In the preface he states fully what he means by each of these terms. Under historical exposition he aims to give the reader the full story of Jesus' life, using all four Gospels impartially, and to set his life in its environment, political, geographical, social and religious. Two interesting and valuable introductory chapters deal with the "Country of Christ" and with "Christ's People." In thus dealing with the life of Jesus in its environment one problem, evidently, confronted the author: the problem of Jesus' human personality. For it is clear that to him Jesus, even as an infant, was aware of his divine mission. Repeatedly he refers to Palestine and the Jews as the land or the nation "to which our Lord deigned to attach Himself." Two chapters are given to his activities before the Incarnation and especially to the prophetic forecasts of his coming. The final chapter in the first volume and, as regarded by the author, I think, one of the major chapters, deals with this subject of Jesus' humanity. The upshot of the discussion is that Luke's well known statements that Jesus "grew and waxed strong, filled with wisdom and the grace of God was upon him" and that "he advanced in wisdom and stature and in favor with God and men" can have only limited meaning. His body admittedly grew but a like statement is not to be made as to his mind and will.

Under "critical exposition" our author professes to use the various form of criticism in order to justify the scientific character of his treatment. The reader of our modern lives of Jesus will be struck with the monotonous uniformity of his conclusions in this field. No text in any one of the Gospels is ever invalidated. Even the fourth verse of the fifth chapter of John, about the angel troubling the waters of the pool of Bethesda, is defended. Occasionally he admits that Matthew, for example, has treated some detail out of its proper order, for some reason of his own, but "criticism" can go no further. The Synoptic problem does not exist. Matthew is the earliest and the most important gospel. One footnote, indeed, referring to the words,

"That you may know that the Son of Man hath power on earth to forgive sins (he saith to the sick of the palsy), I say to thee, arise, take up thy bed and go into thy house," states that "it is remarkable that these words of our Lord have been recorded in identical language by the three Synoptics, including the extraordinary parenthesis which interrupts them for a moment." But neither this nor similar features elsewhere in the Synoptic narrative ever leads him to question the independence of all three Gospels.

Under the third head of "apologetic exposition" our author gives us what seems to me the most interesting and valuable feature of this work. Each volume contains, in appendices, discussions of the various problems raised by others who have dealt with Jesus' life. The conclusions are uniformly orthodox, from the Roman Catholic point of view, but they reveal wide reading and scholarly grasp of the positions taken by others of every school of thought. He divides the world of scholarship into three main groups: Catholic scholars, Protestant scholars and Rationalists. The third group contains many whom most of us would list under the second heading. There are twenty-six appendices to the first volume, covering one hundred and seventy pages, and exactly the same number in the second volume, although here only one hundred and twenty-four pages are required. If any of you should be interested in looking into this work I would venture to suggest that these appendices be read first and that then other portions be read as your time or fancy may determine. I make this suggestion the more confidently because our author evidently counts this the feature of his work which chiefly differentiates it from former Catholic work of a similar sort. He says of himself, "Providence has permitted that, for a number of years, we have had to study thoroughly the enormous mass of books written about our Lord and the Gospels by Rationalists of all shades of opinion." The extensive bibliographical references in the body of the book or in footnotes show how fully this claim is justified. The author knows well a surprisingly large proportion of the chief continental and British authors. So much cannot be said for his knowledge of American scholars. Aside from older writers such as Robinson, Philip



Schaff, Selah Merrill and C. A. Briggs, there are references to only a few. The ones noted are B. W. Bacon (cited as H. Bacon), C. W. Votaw, E. F. Scott (cited as an Anglican), and W. P. Armstrong, and it is perhaps worthy of comment that all of these are known only through articles in one or another of Hastings' *Dictionaries*.

\* \* \* \* \*

The second book, Marnas' *Who Is Then This Man?* is written by a French woman whose scholarship and whose literary gifts are evident upon every page. The translator expresses the conviction that it "may well prove to be the most humanly appealing and most utterly convincing story of the Saviour's life and death since the last of the evangelists laid down his pen at Patmos." And again he says, "It was a woman, her heart aflame with love and sorrow, who once poured the balm of her ointment on the Saviour's feet and hair. It is a woman, one feels convinced after closing *Who Is Then This Man?* who has given us the most artless and fragrant story of the Redemption that ever came from a believing heart."

An outstanding characteristic of this book is its use of rabbinic material. The valuable notes, which are printed at the close of the book rather than in the form of footnotes, contain scores of such references. This material has often been used from two different motives: first, as a means of discrediting the originality of Jesus, and second, to illustrate and clarify Jesus' life and teaching. Needless to say, it is the latter purpose which finds expression in these pages. One wonders, however, whether Klausner's warning is not worthy of attention when he says that all too often many such citations are vitiated because too little attention is paid to the question of dates, it being taken for granted that what is found in a Talmud passage was also true in Jesus' day. Whatever may be said as to this, the extent of the writer's knowledge in this field is notable and impressive.

A surprising feature of the book is its slight emphasis upon the story of Jesus' birth. Following the example of Mark's Gospel it begins with the ministry of John the Baptist. Only three passing references reveal any knowledge of or interest in the story of the birth in Bethlehem.

The most arresting characteristic of the work is its complete confidence that the most minute details of chronology can be determined. Jesus was born December 25, B. C. 5, and died April 7, A. D. 30, and scores of incidents in between are dated with almost equal certainty. One cannot say that the author has no reasons for these conclusions, for the reasons are given; one can only say that the reasons are far from convincing.

A slighter feature is its emphasis, in Jesus' practice, upon the Jewish ceremonial law. Again and again the features of the law are described and the statement confidently made that Jesus and his disciples lived in complete conformity with it. Here, again, such statements do credit to the author's studies but leave at least one reader unconvinced.

It is a book charmingly written, revealing so much genuine feeling as to disarm criticism.

\* \* \* \* \*

The third book on the list, Conway's *Virgin Birth*, is also the smallest. It is written by the Father Conway whose "Question Box" is well known and is published by the Paulist Press. "Zeal for souls outside the Catholic faith" is one of the two main purposes of the Paulist Fathers and one may believe that this little book was written in the hope that it might bring conviction upon this subject to its readers both within and without the Catholic fold. The book has only sixty-two pages, six of which are given to title pages and preface and three to bibliography. Seventeen pages are devoted to the "brethren" of Jesus with the aim of establishing the Roman Catholic doctrine of the perpetual virginity of Mary. I may say that for several years I have placed this little book upon my syllabus in my course on the "Life of Jesus" for I know no place where the position of the Catholic church upon this theme is given more directly and clearly.

\* \* \* \* \*

The fourth book is larger and has the same title. Father Scott, the author, is a Jesuit and an able controversialist. The spirit of its nearly three hundred pages is that of controversy, although frank and fair. It covers a wider field than its title would suggest. In addition to the chapter on the Virgin Birth

there are chapters on Miracles, Evolution, the Resurrection and several other themes. There is a dogmatic tone to the book which probably makes it the least attractive book in the list for Protestant readers.

\* \* \* \* \*

The last book on the list is also one of the most charming. Its very title, *The Radiant Story Of Jesus*, suggests its poetic and uncritical qualities. Its author is described as a distinguished man of letters and its translator, the wife of Herbert Adams Gibbons, of Princeton, is herself well known for her books and magazine articles. The publishers have dealt kindly with the book and given it a most attractive physical appearance. A surprisingly small percentage of the words of the book are those of the author. The bulk is taken directly from the sources used. These are, first, the four Gospels, which are used impartially; second, various passages from the Old Testament prophecies and laws which are happily introduced at many points to illustrate the story, and, such is the charm of the book, this is done in such a way as to still most of our critical questionings as to the propriety of such use; and finally, passages from the apocryphal gospels. One recalls that Professor Case, somewhere in his recent life of Jesus, holds that fuller use should be made of the traditions of the fathers and of the apocryphal gospels. However, one may be sure that he did not contemplate such use as is here to be found. The more extravagant stories from these non-canonical sources are not used but some are introduced which, however interesting, are yet not pleasing to our twentieth century Protestant minds. However, the purpose of the book is edification and not to satisfy our critical judgments. The reviewer in the *New York Times* for December 25, 1927, who called it to my attention, commends the book "for the mood which is tired of criticism and wishes in the full the spirit of poetic and symbolic acceptance." We may accept this as our final word.

\* \* \* \* \*

When, now, we turn to look at the books as a whole the first comment I find arising in my mind is the uniformity of them all. I do not mean uniformity as to literary style, for here they differ markedly, but uniformity in general point of view. The

Jesus who is found in any one of these books is exactly the same Jesus as is found in any other. When one remembers the variety in type to be found in the lives of Jesus written, especially in recent years, by Protestant writers, this fact is sure to attract attention. One can run through the main themes in connection with this story of perennial interest—Jesus' relations with John the Baptist, his baptism, his temptation, his Messianic consciousness, his miracles, his choice of the twelve, his transfiguration, his attitude toward the apocalyptic hopes of his day and other topics which any of you can add—and can recall how various are the attitudes from which any of these themes are treated. Such variety may be displeasing to the Roman Catholic mind; it undoubtedly is. It savors of spiritual anarchy. But at any rate it lends interest to the reading of the numerous books on Jesus' life which are appearing every year.

A second comment is possibly related to the first and I would put it in the form of a question: How far is this uniformity of which I have been speaking to be explained by a lack of freedom which Roman Catholic writers have as compared with us of the Protestant faith? Upon opening four of these five books (the one by Seché is the exception) one notices the words, "*Nihil Obstat*," with the name of the *Censor Librorum*. Three have the "*Imprimatur*" of Archbishop Hayes of New York, the fourth that of Archbishop Glennon of St. Louis. One has the further words, "*Permissu Superiorum*," with the name of the Superior-General, presumably of the writer's Order. Another has the words, "*Imprimi Potest*," with the name of the official in another Order. I am not attempting to make any comment upon this practice. I am only asking the question, How far does this system of supervision, as to the workings of which I have no adequate knowledge, explain the uniformity in the intellectual atmosphere of these books as compared with similar works from Protestant sources? As I was about to write this paragraph I had just finished reading an article by Professor Bacon in a recent number of the *Journal of Biblical Literature*. The theme was the relation of Jesus to John the Baptist. One does not need to accept everything that is found in such an article but one does know that the author had complete freedom to say fully and

frankly what was in his mind to say. Can one feel a like confidence in books over which these words, *Nihil Obstat*, are found?

All the books but one (this exception I have already noted) show a marked interest in the virgin birth of Jesus. Fillion devotes one hundred and forty pages to the subject. Two of the books have this for their title and both make it very clear that the dogma has for them the utmost importance. Seché shows his agreement although his method of doing so is quite different. He does it by embroidering the simplicities of the Gospel narratives by additions from the apocryphal gospels. Of course, there are plenty of Protestant writers who share these convictions, but few, so at least it seems to me, would stress so unequivocally the central significance of this part of the record.

What is true of this theme is equally true of the larger subject of miracles. These stories have an undoubted fascination for all of these writers. It has been a long time since I have really read, as a whole, any one of the older popular lives of Jesus by Protestant writers; I mean such books as those by Farrar or Geikie or David Smith. I have consulted them for special topics and certain chapters I know fairly well. But I doubt whether any of them ever stress these stories as do these books under consideration. There is not time to cite instances but it would be easy to show how the supernatural explanation is always preferred wherever there is any possibility of a choice as between it and the natural. Miracles are referred to repeatedly as having occurred where the Gospel record is at least not clear. Fillion estimates that the Gospel miracles "would certainly amount to hundreds, perhaps thousands, if separately enumerated." Scott not only vigorously defends the miracles of Jesus but, with equal vigor, defends the ecclesiastical miracles at Catholic shrines today. My point here is that there is a difference in warmth and enthusiasm between these Catholic writers and Protestant writers who take the same position. One feels that miracles mean more to these authors than they do to the most orthodox of Protestant men and women.

Other features of these books are more obvious and scarcely need enumeration. One expects the Roman Catholic doctrine of the Church to be stressed. The famous passage in Matthew

16:13-20 receives, as was to be expected, a Catholic interpretation. The epilogue to *Who Is Then This Man?* deals with this theme in words of lyric quality. So also the mother of Jesus and her perpetual virginity, which carries with it the conviction that the "brethren" of Jesus were really his cousins, are repeatedly emphasized. Other things of a like sort might be cited but time forbids.

If it seems that these comments are negative and critical, such has not been my wish. The books have undoubted merits. They have been worth reading. To refer to only one fact, they are charged through and through with a religious spirit. It would be easy to mention books about Jesus where this quality is not so manifest. Here there is no attempt to conceal the fact that the hero of the record is Redeemer and Lord.

I referred at the beginning to the fact that a short time ago I read a similar group of books about Jesus written by Jews. May I close by expressing the wish that our membership contained some who were Jews and Catholics and that in our fellowship at these meetings and in our discussions we might have the advantage of seeing our common problems from the viewpoint of these two groups. In this respect our sister society is more fortunate. May we not do something to bring this to pass? This would not mean that they would convert us or that we should convert them. It would simply mean that men and women, agreeing in so many things, but differing, genuinely and vitally, in others, were eager and able to meet face to face and to receive the best that each had to give.

---



## THE PRE-MOSAIC STAGE IN THE DEVELOPMENT OF THE HEBREW DOCTRINE OF GOD

ELLIS E. PIERCE, Teaching Fellow in English Bible, Drew  
University

The Hebrew people, in their search for God, may be likened to a group of pilgrims, toiling up a mountain-side to a shrine at the summit. This shrine we find in the personality and teachings of the Master, with its resultant modern doctrine of the "Christlike God." In this paper, however, we go with the pilgrims over only the first portion of the journey.

We find them first in a "darkest valley," called "Animism," living in the darkness of superstition and fear, and worshipping trees, stones, and waters. It must be remembered that the literature dealing with this early period is very meagre, consequently we can not give any definite *proof* for any of our assertions. We can only give evidence, and say that in the light of this evidence, such-and-such is probably the case. We will, however, use the earliest source available, and so all references, unless otherwise specified, will be found in the "J" document.\*

Let us consider the matter of waters first. In Genesis 14, 7, we find these words, "Retracing their steps, they reached En-mishpat." The evidence here is all in that word, "En-mishpat," which literally means, "spring of judgment," so-called because of the oracular decisions which were obtained there. From the above passage it seems that this spring had long been considered as a sacred place, possessing a spirit or "numen" which could give oracular decisions and foretell the future; and that this spring was well enough known so that even at the time of J (c. 850 B. C.) it was called by its ancient name, "Spring of Judgment." Another famous "sacred well" was that of Beer-sheba, where theophanies were vouchsafed to Hagar, Isaac, Jacob (Israel), and Elijah. (Cf. Gen. 21, 33 and 26, 23ff (J); 21, 17ff, and 46, 1f (E); 1 K 19, 1-8). Even as late as the time of Amos we find that oaths by its numen were denounced.

\* All biblical quotations are from *The Old Testament, an American Translation*, published by the University of Chicago Press.

They who swear by Ashimah of Samaria,  
And say, 'As thy god lives, O Dan,'  
And 'As thy god lives, O Beersheba;'  
They shall fall, not to rise up again.

*Amos 8, 14.*

As regards the worship of stones, we have the story of Jacob's dream (Gen. 28, 10-19—JE). This piece of evidence is rather vague, but certain important facts are to be found in it. First of all, an important theophany occurred here and Jacob thought that it must in some way have been connected with the stone which he used for a pillow, as on the morrow he took the stone and anointed it; and after setting it up as a sacred "pillar" named the place "Beth-el" which means "House of God." The name must have arisen out of a conception that the numen of the stone upon which Jacob laid his head was responsible for the dream and for the theophany which was connected with it. The statement that he anointed the stone is further evidence of this contention.

Still other evidence is to be found in the various "gilgals" to be found throughout Palestine. The name itself means "stone circle," and they must have been similar in character to the cromlechs of other primitive religions and to the famous Stonehenge of England. The earlier prophets were very bitter in their denunciation of these gilgals. (Cf. Hosea 4, 15; 9, 15; 12, 11; Amos 4, 4f; 5, 5f.) They state most emphatically that to worship there, would be a form of worship hostile to the religion of Jahweh, the reason being that the monotheism of the prophets could not tolerate the worship of the numens of these shrines. The prophets, by their very condemnation, bear testimony to the effect that their numens were there worshipped. It will be noticed too that Amos, along with the gilgals (and especially *the* Gilgal in the Jordan valley), condemns also the worship of the sacred stone at Bethel and the sacred well at Beer-sheba.

We have many references to sacred trees, or at least to trees beside which were to be found sanctuaries, or in the shade of which theophanies occurred. (Cf. Gen. 13, 18; 18, 1; Jo. 24, 26; Jg. 6, 11-21.)

There were two points of view from which the primitive man looked at trees. It might give a welcome shade or fruit. In that case he thought it was because there was some friendly spirit in that tree which wished to help him. On the other hand, a tree might be poisonous or might have thorns which would lacerate his flesh. The primitive man accounted for this by the theory that there was a malignant spirit in that tree which wished to harm him. In either case, there was a spirit, to be either worshipped or appeased. Consequently, altars were erected and sanctuaries were the result. These the Hebrews took over when they entered the country and incorporated in their own religion, a later development of theology ascribing the altars and the worship there to Jahweh.

It is admitted that none of the references here quoted prove anything when taken singly. But in the aggregate they do show that in all probability the Hebrews, like other primitive peoples, passed through an animistic stage in the development of their religion.

\* \* \*

Having left the "Valley of the Shadow of Death" we now find the pilgrims gradually ascending the mountain, passing through a dense dark forest in which many strange animals were found and worshipped; and overhead, and fluttering among the leaves, were many spirits, the spirits of the departed dead which were revered and served.

Having passed through an animistic period, the next stage in religious development is naturally that of the totemistic; the "totem" being an animal which was frequently regarded as the ancestor of the tribe, and which must not be killed or maltreated, and was commonly worshipped, a sort of tribal ancestor worship.

Our first bit of evidence comes from the story of the temptation and fall. (Gen. 3, 1-5.) There are two important facts to be noted in this story. First, the serpent talks in a very human manner, an act which is not customary with serpents. More important, however, is the fact that Eve shows no astonishment whatever at hearing the serpent speak. She takes it just as a matter of course and holds a conversation with it in

much the same manner that she would converse with a friend—if she had one—or with Adam her husband. If this account had been in the form of a fable, then we would not think so much of this point; for in fables plants and animals do converse like human beings. But in this passage J tells the incident, not as a fable to illustrate some truth, but as history, and herein lies the evidence. Totemistic society believed that animals really did possess such powers, and the fact that Eve was not surprised to hear the serpent address her shows at least a definitely totemistic point of view.

Consider also the brazen serpent of the wilderness wanderings. (Num. 21, 6-9.) Here the representation of the serpent is considered as possessing miraculous healing powers,—a pronounced totemistic conception. Moreover the Hebrews worshipped serpents down to the days of Hezekiah, when the practice was put to an end by a reform instigated by Isaiah and carried out by the king.

He also broke in pieces the bronze serpent that Moses had made; for as late as those days the Israelites offered sacrifices to it.

*II Kings 18, 4.*

Further evidence is to be found in the "unclean animals" (see Deut. 14, 3-20), the original conception of which probably was the same as that of the "taboo" of the modern savage. It merely means something that is "consecrated" and hence not to be eaten. Nor must we forget the evidence to be found in certain tribal names such as Rachel ("ewe"), Leah ("cow"), Shimeon ("wolf"), and Caleb ("dog"). These names were probably the names of the totem ancestors of the clan, which in later times were applied to individuals, as in the case of the above references.

A further development of the animistic idea is found in ancestor worship, the main lines of evidence being found in the mourning customs and the "Levirate Law." The idea behind the mourning customs was that the spirit of the dead might injure the living. To avert this calamity the mourners and all who knew the departed would strive to make themselves unrecognizable by cutting themselves, shaving off their beards and tearing their hair, rending their clothes and wearing sackcloth

(Jer. 16, 5f; 41, 4f; 2 S. 3, 31; Gen. 37, 34)—thinking that if the spirit of the dead could not recognize them, he would not harm them.

This idea was carried to such an extent that sacrifices, probably in the form of food placed on the grave, were made to the departed spirits.

When you have finished telling out all the dues of your produce in the third year, . . . you must declare before the Lord your God, ' . . . I have given it to the Levite. . . . I have not offered any of it to the dead. . . .'—*Deut.* 26, 12ff.

This passage, although deprecating the practice, implies a custom of giving sacrifices of food for the dead, as is now the custom in China.

Perhaps the main evidence, however, is to be found in the "Levirate Law." (*Deut.* 25, 5f.) The idea underlying this law is that a dead man who has no male children (female children do not count) will miss something through not receiving that kind of worship which ancestors in early times appear to have received, and the purpose of the law is to prevent any deceased person being left without some one on earth to sacrifice to him and to do him reverence. (Cf. Stade, *Geschichte des Volkes Israel*, p. 390 ff.)

\* \* \*

Gradually the trees and underbrush grow less dense, and the pilgrims are now in polytheism, worshipping many gods, but still on a much higher level than they have been hitherto.

The very names for God used by the Hebrews are of interest to us in that respect. The common Semitic name for God is merely "El," as seen in Beth-el ("House of God") and Bab-el ("Gate of God"). However, we have many combinations of this word with others to give us the names of various deities. Among these are El Olam (*Gen.* 21, 33), El Roi (*Gen.* 16, 13), El Shaddai (*Gen.* 17, 1), El Elyon (*Gen.* 14, 18), El Pachad (*Gen.* 31, 42), and El Berith (*Jg.* 9, 46). It is thought by many scholars that originally these were names for distinct deities which later theology took over and made into various titles of Jahweh. Of this we cannot be sure, but we do have unmistakable evidence in the "teraphim" or household gods.

When Laban was away shearing his sheep, Rachel stole the household gods that belonged to her father. . . . (Jacob and Rachel now flee, carrying with them the teraphim. Laban is told in a dream that they are gone and starts out to follow them). . . . So when Laban came up with Jacob, . . . (he) said to Jacob,

"What do you mean by outwitting me . . . ? So now you are off, because of course you longed for your father's home! *But why did you steal my gods?*"—*Gen.* 31, 19-35 (E).

This passage shows, first of all, that these teraphim were carried about as the most precious possessions of the home. When Rachel left she took them with her. She had to steal them because she knew her father would not part with them otherwise. Then when Laban found that they were gone, immediately he set out to recover them. Later, when they finally came to an agreement, they sealed their covenant by an oath which can be none other than polytheistic

May the God of Abraham and the God of Nahor (the gods of their ancestors) be judge between us.—*Gen.* 31, 53.

Consider also the story of the founding of the Danite sanctuary at Laish (*Jg.* 17, 5; 18, 2-20). In this story the reverence in which these teraphim were held had gone to such an extent that they even had a priest consecrated to their service. Moreover, they were considered of such importance that an expedition of war consisting of six hundred men was sent to capture them and if possible secure the services of their priest also.

Moreover, the worship of the teraphim seems to have continued until the reformation under Josiah (2 K. 23, 24). Although in later times they seem to have been connected with the worship of Jahweh, as in the time of David, still their use in earlier times, taken with the various names for deity then in use, seems to show conclusively the existence of a polytheistic stage in the religion of the Hebrews.

Lastly, it is definitely stated that at one time the Hebrews were polytheists.

Therefore, stand in awe of the Lord, and serve him faithfully and loyally; remove the gods whom your fathers served beyond the River and in Egypt, and serve the Lord. However, if you find it obnoxious to serve the Lord, choose today whom you will serve, either the gods whom your fathers served who are beyond the River, or the gods of the



Amorites in whose land you are living; but as for me and my house, we will serve the Lord.—*Josh. 24, 14f* (JE.).

This condition of polytheism lasted until the time of Moses, and with him we find the beginning of a definitely Hebrew doctrine of God. Previously the Hebrews had had nothing distinctive; but merely reflected the current thought of their age and stage of culture. It has been part of the purpose of this brief paper to demonstrate that fact. Under Moses they make a great forward step. He introduced them to Jahweh, and to the worship of Him only. Moses was not a monotheist, he did not deny the existence of other gods, but he would worship but one. It is significant, too, that the God he worshipped was an ethical deity who required an ethical form of worship.

The pilgrims still have a long, long way to go before they arrive at the shrine, but they are not wandering blindly any more. Under Moses they at last have a guide for their spiritual journey. The rest of the story, their progress, their disappointments, how they often lost the road and found it again; and the discoveries they made, form a fascinating story, much stranger than fiction, as Dr. Browne put it; but due to lack of space, we must leave them here.

---

THE editorial board of the newly formed Scientific Book Club is composed of Dr. Kirtley F. Mather, geologist, Harvard; Dr. Arthur H. Compton, physicist, Chicago; Dr. Edward L. Thorndike, psychologist, Columbia; Dr. Edward C. Conklin, biologist of Princeton, and Professor Harlan T. Stetson, Director of Perkins Observatory at Ohio Wesleyan University.

## COOPERATION AMONG THE SEMINARIES

GARDINER M. DAY

The increasing importance of the Interseminary movement in bringing together the thought and work of theological students all over the country has lately shown itself in three particular ways: (1) through the splendid interseminary conferences in as different parts of the country as New England and Texas; (2) in the desire of the individual students to overcome all denominational limitations; and (3) by the reports that have been coming in of the very cordial reception that Mr. Gale Seaman, the field secretary of the Interseminary Movement, has received in seminaries of extremely different denominations in various parts of the country.

In line with the first of the foregoing, a most interesting conference of Japanese theological students was held in New York City last December. Sixteen students met, through the courtesy of the Japanese Christian Association, from Union Theological Seminary, Princeton, Auburn, Yale, Berkeley, and Westminster. The purpose of the conference was to promote friendship, and the account which we have received from one of the Japanese students reports that it accomplished its purpose exceptionally well. At almost the same time a tri-seminary conference was held at the Biblical Seminary in New York, including Union, General, and the Biblical. Three papers were presented by representatives of each seminary, dealing with various aspects of humanism, and after a discussion, the conference closed with a service of worship.

The fifth annual Interseminary Conference of New England was held February 7-8, and had on its program such outstanding men as Dean Weigle of Yale, Dr. Jerome Davis, the Rev. Morgan P. Noyes, and Dr. Robert E. Speer.

In the movement of thought among the theological schools, we call attention especially to two tendencies. The first of these is the evidence of a beginning of a revival of interest in religious drama. This is seen both in the interest among the students of the seminaries and also by the demand for religious plays on the part of the churches themselves. We noted a year ago the ap-

pointment of Professor Fred Eastman to a chair of Religious Drama at the Chicago Theological Seminary. In a recent study that was made in Chicago, it was found that of sixty-five churches, fifty-six were using drama in one form or another, producing in all about 200 plays and pageants. About 50 per cent of the plays were non-biblical but of a religious nature. Among them were such plays as: "Why the Chimes Rang," "The Color Line," and "The Valiant." If this were merely a chance fact, it might not indicate anything, but a study of other cities would no doubt reveal a very similar situation. The rebirth of this interest in religious drama is not due merely to a whim but is due to a real need of modern Protestantism, and augurs well for the future. It is evident also that religious people have become sufficiently liberal minded not to demand a strictly biblical play, and thus the field is open for greater possibilities than has been true for years in the past.

Another trend of thought which is extremely evident to anyone in touch with theological students and faculties today is that our changing world does not demand more ministers as much as it does better ministers, not so much quantity as quality. Through the medium of magazines and radio and other means of communication, a single minister can reach a great many more people than used to be the case; and while there never was a time when the need for the personal touch in life was greater than today, nevertheless the average individual would rather have ten minutes with a keen personality than two hours with a well-meaning but mediocre personality. An editorial which appeared in a recent issue of *The Churchman* is so much to the point that we feel it well worth while to reprint part of it here:

*The Living Church* points out that, generally speaking, we do not need more ministers but rather ministers who will dedicate themselves to special forms of service and that particularly we need unmarried ministers. An article in *The Congregationalist* reflects much the same point of view. We note ourselves, in a former editorial, symptoms of dissatisfaction among men who are already in the ministry, as shown in several recent articles in current magazines. We learn from good authority that 1,000 out of 6,000-odd clergymen in the Episcopal Church are on the inactive list, and but a small percentage of these are retired.

Conditions are rapidly changing. Not a few business organizations are doing more work of various kinds than they did a few years ago, with less men employed in the actual doing of it because of new machinery and inventions.

Many of our American small towns are over-churched. If this situation is to be corrected, it means less ministers. Particularly in rural districts, one or two live personalities, vibrant with the spirit of Christ, with adequate support from fairly unified groups of people, can do a great deal more than a half dozen ministers living as fine disciples of Christ, but tormented by petty quarrels between their handful and the Rev. Mr. Blank's handful, not to mention continuous worry concerning the raising of the budget. Laymen are recognizing these facts and, by economic pressure, forcing the churches in small towns to unite or retire in favor of a stronger one. This means less ministers. The result is that we need today not more ministers, but rather the best equipped men we can possibly find. In short, we need quality, not quantity.

The editorial then goes on to suggest that Dr. Drury or some of the other headmasters of our large preparatory schools hold a conference of their own graduates who are in business, on the general theme: "Can a Man Be Christian in Business Today?"

Any one who is close to seminaries is always hearing criticisms of what goes on within them. Hence, it may be worth while to print here a copy of the criticism of seminary life made by a seminary graduate of the class of 1928, which is printed in a copy of *The Interseminarian*, a news sheet circulated in mimeograph form by the Interseminary Movement and edited by Mr. Seaman:

(1) The critical faculty becomes over-developed while the appreciative faculty atrophies. That is deadly to the spirit of devotion.

(2) Religious questions are argued as if they were forensic questions, divorced from life. Many a fellow who almost loses his soul in the seminary, finds himself when he puts his heart on the heart of the world and thinks and feels religion in terms of the world's life, in specifics.

(3) The fundamental trouble is that studying religion and discussing religious questions is mistaken for the practice of religion, or takes the place of the "practice of the presence of God" in daily life.

## A NEW INTEREST

PRESIDENT EMERITUS WILLIAM OXLEY THOMPSON

Recently there has been some evidence of a new emphasis in religious education. In the earlier years about which we so often speak the home was assumed to be the birthplace of ideals, morals, reverence and of spiritual life. No doubt this was essentially true. Later the Sunday school came in as a supplementary factor. In most cases it was primitive and crude. It had some virtues, however, namely, that it dealt with the Scriptures somewhat continuously and did not trouble itself overmuch with the doctrinal issues. It taught the Scriptures, urged faith in God and in Christ and left most questions except the obviously moral ones for later consideration. The church as such did not enlist very heartily at the beginning in the Sunday school work. One could always find those who favored the sanctuary and the pulpit but were not much inclined to the frivolities of Sunday school teachers. Nearly a generation ago some of the churches took over the management of and responsibility for the Sunday school. The collection box seems to have been the source of irritation. Later it developed into a desire to keep the Sunday school in harmony with the church. This was a natural and proper development but it seems strange to see what important measures have grown out of the penny contributions of children.

Later, along came the organization of voluntary conventions which flowered into the International Sunday School Association. Under this movement from the days of B. F. Jacobs and others, came the Uniform Lesson Committee. This brought about greatly improved lesson helps. The editors were stimulated and produced through facile writers a greatly improved Sunday school literature. Quite naturally and properly the editors and publishers soon began to organize for cooperative efficiency. This brought into the field another group of people who in some measure paralleled the teaching of the Sunday school, stimulated it and greatly assisted it. The result was that after some years the well-known Committee of Reference and Counsel began a series of conferences with the International Sunday School Association and after two years there was consummated at the convention in

Kansas City in 1922 what is now known as the International Council of Religious Education. This was perhaps the first nation-wide organization taking with great seriousness the problems of religious education.\* It brought denominational support from about forty denominations. It changed the character of the quadrennial convention to a representative body in which the denominations are proportionately recognized. The International Council is therefore at present the active promoter of religious education among all the denominations.

Among these other agencies may be mentioned the fact that Bible schools sprang up as a sort of voluntary independent agency recognizing both the need and the importance of religious education. Their principal objectives were: (1) Religious education; (2) Knowledge of the Scriptures; (3) Evangelism. They undertook to prepare teachers and to do whatever else they could to increase the interest in and the efficiency of religious education.

Another factor in the case was the college curriculum. Higher education in the earlier days dwelt in the upper years of the course with such problems as natural theology and evidences of Christianity, using authors like Paley, Butler's *Analogy*, and later on Fisher's *Theism*. After a time this passed into a more or less disconnected effort to set out a Christian philosophy and to face some of the scientific problems as presented in the departments of philosophy and psychology. Recently the interest in religious education has had a genuine revival in the colleges. At the beginning it was a little chaotic. Later it has become somewhat more systematic. There is now a conscious need for the preparation of competent teachers of religious education in these institutions.

Now, interestingly enough, we are hearing of another interest in religious education culminating in the theological seminaries. In November, Dr. Gaius J. Slosser was inaugurated and installed as Professor of Ecclesiastical History and History of Doctrine in the Western Theological Seminary, Pittsburgh. Aside from or in addition to the interest developed by the occasion, came the

\* The term "religious education" is here used technically. The Council of Church Boards of Education, a nation-wide organization to promote Christian education, broadly conceived, was founded in 1911.—*The Editor*.



opportunity to speak of the desirable union of some of the evangelical churches, Dr. Slosser having come from the Methodist Episcopal Church, now entering upon his duties as professor in a Presbyterian seminary more than a century old.

The principal interest however centered in the outline of the work of the department in which Dr. Slosser is to teach. This was decidedly more educational than any address would have been on a similar occasion a generation ago. For example, Dr. Slosser set out the desirability of "greater activity in the way of laboratory work or original investigation and collection of source materials; for the production of church history text books which are more profusely illustrated, with more attention given to human interest and life; for a greater emphasis on biography and upon the bearing that the character of the leaders had in shaping their policies; for the stressing and extension of the historical method, that is, the stripping of the history of any given event, man, or period of all legends or unfounded tradition, of all over-statements or under-statements, and of any mistaken linking to what preceded or what followed."

In addition to the general outline suggested above, Dr. Slosser brought a new emphasis upon the desirability of stressing more than hitherto the study of contemporaneous, secular history, of geography, of current philosophies, of racial migrations, of psychology and of the social and economic problems and activities of the various epochs.

This occasion struck a new note of hope. History is the record of our progress. It properly includes all our activities. Ecclesiastical history being a part of this progress may well be studied in its relation to all other factors. It looks as if this particular seminary, not to mention others, may be preparing a new interest for the young theologues by giving them an example in scientific interpretation of history and a proper evaluation of character as an asset in religious education.

Now that the matter of religious education has been properly introduced as presented to all the grades from the kindergarten to the theological student, let us hope that the next generation of ministers in the church will have a more sympathetic relation to education as fundamental in all reliable evangelism.

## REPORT OF THE COMMITTEE ON RELIGIOUS EDUCATION

WILLIAM S. BOVARD, Chairman

*Mr. Chairman and Members of the Council:*

Your committee consists of members who carry exacting responsibilities and therefore find it difficult to work out together a matured report which could be easily credited to the combined judgment of the committee. The members, however, have had an opportunity to compare their individual investigations in a conference here, and agree to offer this paper as a contribution to the discussions of the Council.

We wish to offer the following considerations as indicating the place and relative importance of religious education in the movement of organized Christianity:

1. For more than twenty years the movement among the churches for more effective teaching in religion has gathered momentum. The leaders of the church have now quite generally accorded education in religion a place of major importance.
2. The reorganization of the International Sunday School Association, the Sunday School Council of Evangelical Denominations, and the International Lesson Committee into the International Council of Religious Education with its Educational Committee is an achievement in organization resulting from a rising tide of interest in a better quality of religious education in the local church.
3. The literature treating of the manifold problems of religious education is amazing in quantity and abounds in volumes of genuine merit. Practically all the churches have revised and enriched their current magazines and "Lesson Helps" in accord with the new possibilities in the teaching program. A life centered program, rather than a lesson centered program obtains today.
4. The agencies charged with the advancement of religion by means of education have been subjected to close scrutiny as to their success or failure:

(a) The home and family where children should receive such nurture and training as tend to assure the choice of the Christian way of life have been found wanting to an alarming extent. The far-seeing leaders of the movement for religious education are trying to recover the place of primacy for the home and family. (See *The Christian Family* by Fiske, of Oberlin.)

(b) The changes which have taken place in the Sunday sessions of the church school are legion. The new type of church building which provides for an educational program of intellectual respectability is no longer rare. The curriculum for these church schools has been developed so fast that it has outrun the training of adequate teachers to use it effectively.

(c) Much has been accomplished by cooperating with the public school authorities in securing released time for the pupils of certain hours during the week when they may receive instruction in religion.

5. The colleges and universities under church auspices have moved rapidly toward providing courses and departments for the education and training of men and women who may give full time to the advancement of religious education. There is an increasing demand for a body of professionally trained directors or ministers of religious education. Dr. Edward S. Boyer read a paper before the Council at its meeting in 1928, at Atlantic city, on "Crisis-Points in the Present Development of Religious Education in Colleges and Universities." Each of the seven points discussed indicates that religion as a body of knowledge and an important part of history-making life must be accorded a large place in a truly liberal education.

#### FAIR CRITICISM OF THE MOVEMENT

If any enthusiastic devotees of religious education were inclined to invest it with plenary powers in modifying life and civilization, they are being disillusioned. Fortunately most of the toilers in this field knew from the beginning that education cannot go faster than the unfolding life of the individual and of the successive generations. Dr. Herman H. Horne, of New York University, warns the responsible leaders of the present-day

religious education movement of the following outstanding dangers:

- (1) A God without transcendence—an extremely humanistic conception of God.
- (2) A religion without Christ at the center.
- (3) A religion without external authority. He does not indicate the form the desired external authority shall take. He does suggest that it must be willingly made internal.
- (4) A religion without personal immortality. If man is biological only, what basis is there for immortality.

Dr. Horne also offers six outstanding needs:

- (1) A thoroughgoing evaluation of Dr. Dewey's philosophy as a basis for religious education. Manifestly he does not rank the philosophy of Dr. Dewey as infallible. He fears that some of the most influential leaders accept it at 100 per cent.
- (2) The treatment of religious education from the Christian standpoint. He strongly urges the recovery of the term "Christian education."
- (3) The need of teachers who do not destroy old values without substituting new ones. He believes in teachers who are chiefly concerned with the life of the student, rather than exhausting the subject.
- (4) A better functioning church. He thinks that what 700 ministers believe is not as important as what they ought to believe. He thinks a real philosophy of life is better than a questionnaire.
- (5) A technique of mysticism. Mysticism should not be reserved for the mystics. This technique should include the vision of Christ, the art of prayer, the open mind, the waiting soul, the willing heart.
- (6) A personalistic philosophy of education and life. The primacy of persons among the values of the universe. Man is something more than a biochemical entity. The heart of the universe is something more personal and responsible than a cosmic machine.

While Dr. Horne may rank as somewhat reactionary in the estimation of some apostles of the new and fresh, he certainly has sensed the subtle danger of the psychology that attempts to account fully for man in terms of biological data, and the philosophy that has no place for a transcendent God, and therefore reduces prayer to "the social reach of human aspiration." See Coe's *What is Christian Education?*

It is a sobering challenge to the whole educational enterprise of the churches to contemplate the ideals, character and service of the generations which have passed from childhood to maturity

exposed and re-exposed to the educating agencies of the churches. There is much heartening evidence that the educational ministry of the church has not been in vain, but there is no room for a complacency that would halt any movement for greater effectiveness.

In concluding this report, your Committee would call attention to the interdependence of the several types of education being fostered by the churches.

The home, the church, and the cooperation of the public schools contribute to the rising level of an educated childhood. Upon this plateau may rest a loftier range of educated young people as they come to the colleges; from this educated range of college youth will come the climate-changing leaders who are high and lifted up because the lower levels have been raised. This leadership, coming from the colleges and universities in turn, must pay its debt to the homes and churches and schools which are putting better values into the foundations of education. One of the obvious values of this Council is to strengthen the bonds of correlation among all these character-growing agencies in the field of education.

## THE ROLLINS CHAPEL

## Dartmouth College

On the 25th day of June, 1884, the cornerstone of Rollins Chapel was laid at Dartmouth College and one year later the building was formally dedicated. It was the gift of Edward Ashton Rollins, of the class of 1851, in memory of his parents and his wife, Ellen Hobbs Rollins. In exterior appearance the building is much the same today. It is located on the northeast corner of the Dartmouth campus and is one of the oldest landmarks of the College. But the growth of the student body, beginning with the presidency of William Jewett Tucker in 1893, necessitated the enlargement of the old building. The present chapel contains increased auditorium facilities in the form of an addition to the body of the building which doubled the former seating capacity.

The Streeter organ, considered one of the finest among organs existing among American colleges, is located in the Rollins Chapel. Organ recitals by noted artists and by members of the Dartmouth faculty are given there periodically.

Compulsory chapel attendance at Dartmouth was dropped in 1923. Since that time voluntary chapel exercises have been held daily and recognized leaders in the ministry have been invited to Hanover to conduct the Sunday chapel services. The appointment of Dr. Roy Bullard Chamberlin to the chair of Fellow in Religion has given the College a director of chapel activity. He has invited members of the faculty to conduct the daily services from time to time and is actively engaged in furthering the work of the Dartmouth Christian Association and of other religious activity in the College. Daily chapel services are held in the middle of the morning when classes are suspended for a twenty-minute period.

SIDNEY C. HAYWARD, *Assistant to the President*